

A 11. *Ph*
T R E A T I S E
OF THE
H O L Y T R I N U N I T Y.

In Two Parts.

T H E F I R S T,
Asserting the Deity of Jesus Christ
and the Holy Spirit, in the Unity
of Essence with God the Father.

T H E S E C O N D,
In Defence of the former, containeth
Answers to the chiefest Objecti-
ons made against this Doctrine.

By *Isaac Marlow.* *H*

John I. 1, 2, 3. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: The same was in the Beginning with God: All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

LONDON, Printed for the Author, and
are to be sold by *Richard Baldwin*
in the *Old-Baily*, 1690. *25*

1121: d. 13

A *11. 166*
T R E A T I S E
OF THE
H O L Y T R I N U N I T Y.

In Two Parts.

T H E F I R S T,
Asserting the Deity of Jesus Christ
and the Holy Spirit, in the Unity
of Essence with God the Father.

T H E S E C O N D,
In Defence of the former, containeth
Answers to the chiefest Objections
made against this Doctrine.

By *Isaac Marlow.* *K*

John I. 1, 2, 3. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: The same was in the Beginning with God: All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

LONDON, Printed for the Author, and
are to be sold by *Richard Baldwin*
in the *Old-Baily*, 1690. *25*

2213-4-1

YTHINK T 101

UdC and
UdU



92e

m
S
t
fl
p
t
H
C
t
L
C
l
t
a
t
L

To the Reader.

Christian Reader,

HAVING met with some opposition to the Doctrine of the Holy Trinunity, it occasioned my more than ordinary Meditations on this Subject, wherein I received great satisfaction of Mind. And notwithstanding the Socinians have taken great pains to find out Arguments to support their Error, yet I found they had no Foundation in the Holy Scriptures: And nothing is more the Duty of every Christian than to inform himself of the Truth as it is in Jesus, both in the Doctrinal and Practical Parts of the Christian Faith: And tho the Knowledge of every sacred Truth is worth the treasuring up in our Hearts, yet there are some more than others conducing to the Glory of God, and the mutual Fellowship of Christians.

To the Reader.

Among which the blessed Doctrine of the Holy Trin-unity is the chiefest: for to deny the Deity of Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost, is a great deprivation not only of the Glory of these two Divine Subsistencies, but also of the Father: For he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father, Joh. 5. 23. And unless we see the Divine Rays of the Son, we cannot see the Father, chap. 14. 9. And if we have not the same Light, we cannot walk in the same Fellowship: for what Communion hath Light with Darkness, 1 Joh. 1. 7. 2 Cor. 6. 14. Moreover, seeing that the Fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom: and [the Knowledg of the Holy is Understanding,] Prov. 9. 10. and that the Welfare of our Souls depends on our knowledg of God, and true Faith in him, as he is revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures to be our Saviour, it is highly necessary, and the duty of every Christian to have a true distinct Knowledg of

To the Reader.

of God, subsisting in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For as neither an implicit Faith can secure us from being turned aside by every wind of Doctrine, and cunning Craftiness of them that lie in wait to deceive: so unless we have true Notions of the Holy Trinity, we cannot worship God aright.

To the end therefore that those who have not a good understanding of this Doctrine, may be inlightned, and more establisb'd therein, and may have somewhat to answer, and stop the mouths of Gainsayers; and that others may be convinced of their Error, and confirmed in the Truth, I have presented this small Treatise to publick view.

And tho I am sensible of my own Weakness, and Incapacity to manage this Inconceivable Mystery, so as to suit and correspond with the Grandure and Perfection of it; yet there is such Evidence and clear Demonstration given from the Word of Truth, of the Deity of our Blessed Lord and the Holy

To the Reader.

ly Spirit, as might easily gain it credence in the Minds of those that do oppose it, if their Imbecillity were not such as to limit the mysterious and transcendent manner of God's Being to their finite Reason; and make the Scriptures subservient to it: And therefore to those it is my humble Request:

1. That with a studious and intentive Spirit they will peruse this little Treatise.

2. That no former Prepossessions may hinder their full adherence to what hath Divine Authority stamp'd upon it, and then I doubt not of some good Effects of my Labour. For this Fundamental Truth hath so firm a Foundation in the Holy Scriptures, as will stand the shock of all the Socinian Arguments: And tho I have not here undertaken to answer the multitude of them, or of their Objections made against this Doctrine, or any particular Author on this Subject; yet I have taken hold, as I conceive, of the chiefeft Pillars on which their Fabrick depends; and those being taken away, their whole Building will fall. Which that it wholly may, and that every Christian may be establish'd in the Truth of God, Is the Prayer of him, who desires to be a true Worshipper of the Trinne God, and is a Well-wisher to all Men.

I. M.

The CONTENTS.

- Chap. I.** THE Case is briefly stated. *Pag. 1.*
- Chap. II.** Sheweth that there is but one God, the Creator of all things. *Pag. 6.*
- Chap. III.** Asserteth a Plurality of Divine Subsistences. *Pag. 8.*
- Chap. IV.** Proveth the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1. By his Names, *Pag. 11.* 2. That God in the Old Testament in divers Places, is Christ in the New. *Pag. 13.* 3. By seven particular Texts of Scriptures. *Pag. 16.* 4. That Christ preexisted his Incarnation in his Divine Nature. *Pag. 26.* And is no Angel incarnate, *Pag. 30.* but is eternal. *Pag. 32.* 5. By his Works. *Pag. 35.* 6. By Divine Worship given to him. *Pag. 38.*
- Chap. V.** Proveth the Deity of the Holy Ghost. 1. That he is a Divine Person. *Pag. 43.* 2. His Deity is asserted from several Scriptures. *Pag. 45.* 3. By his Works. *Pag. 48.* 4. By Divine Worship. *Pag. 52.*
- Chap. VI.** Proveth the Unity of the Holy Trinity. *Pag. 54.*
- Chap. VII.** Containeth some Explications of the Holy Trinity. 1. Of the essential Being of God. *Pag. 64.* 2. Of a Divine Person. *Pag. 64.* 3. Of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. *Pag. 65, 66.* 4. Of the Unity of the Holy Trinity. *Pag. 66.* 5. Of the Distinctions between the Divine Nature and the Persons, and some Shadows by way of Comparison. *Pag. 67.* 6. Of the Union of Christ's two Natures. *Pag. 74.*

PART

The Contents.

PART II.

Chap. I. Answereth Objections against the Scriptural Proofs of Christ's Deity. *Page 76.*

Chap. II. Answers to Objections drawn from several Texts of Scripture. *Pag. 123.*

Chap. III. Answers to several Arguments against the Deity of Christ. *Pag. 128.*

Chap. IV. Answers to several Objections against the Scriptures that prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost. *Pag. 132.*

Chap. V. Answers to some Objections drawn from divers Scriptures to disprove the Deity of the Holy Spirit. *Pag. 157.*

Chap. VI. Answers to some Scriptures from whence our Adversaries assert that the Father only is the true God. With a general Answer and Conclusion. *Pag. 169.*

A

la
W
Fa

(1)

A

TREATISE

OF THE

Holy Trinunity.

In Two Parts.

PART I.

CHAP. I.

*In which after a short Introduction,
the Case is briefly stated.*

GOD who at sundry Times,
and in divers Manners, spake
in Times past unto the Fathers
by the Prophets; hath in these
last Days spoken unto us by his Son:
Who first in his own Person declared the
Father's Will, and then by his Holy Apo-
B stles,

stles, through the Spirit, more fully opened the Mysteries (that had been hid from Ages and Generations) unto his Saints, and left them upon Sacred Record for future Ages. By which means we come to the knowledg not only of the Grace, Office and Operations of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but of the great Mystery of these Three, for ever blessed, holy, and divine Persons, subsisting in the Unity of the Godhead from all Eternity. But no sooner did the Glory of the Holy Trinity begin to shine in the Ministration of the Gospel of Jesus Christ: But Satan the Prince of Darkness (lest Men should imbrace the Truth, and so his Kingdom should fall) did what he could to hinder the Progress of the Gospel in its primitive Purity, and in Enmity to the weal of Mankind, suggested many pernicious Errours into their Minds, as we may find in the Writings of the Apostles of our Blessed Lord, which I forbear here to mention.

And throughout every successive Age he hath not wanted some Instruments, to disturb the Peace of the Church with false and erronious Doctrines, thereby to weaken the true Interest of Jesus Christ,

as well as to ruin the Souls of Men.

And among others that have been broached in the World, this is one, *viz.* That the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit, are not one infinite and eternal God, Coessential with the Father, but are so much inferiour in Nature to him, as to be but Creatures only.

But to speak more particularly, Some affirm that Jesus Christ is only humane, or nothing but Man : And though the Racovian Catechism, doth acknowledg he is more than a meer Man ; yet they do not allow Christ to have a divine Nature, as we may see in *Pag.* 27, 28. of that Catechism : Where by way of Question, they say, Is the Lord Jesus then a meer Man ? The Answer is, by no means ; For he was conceived of the Holy Spirit, and born of the Virgin *Mary* ; and therefore is, from his very Conception and Birth, the Son of God, as we read *Luke* 1. 30. and the Answer is closed with these Words, That the Lord Jesus ought by no means to be reputed a meer Man.

Yet the next Question being put, Hath he not also a Divine Nature ? The Answer is, At no Hand ; for that is repug-

nant not only to found Reason, but also to the Holy Scriptures.

Now if they will not allow Jesus Christ to have a Divine Nature, and yet do say he is more than a meer Man; what can he then be? unless we suppose either (as *Biddle* saith Article 6. of his Confession of Faith) that the Holy Spirit is an Angel, and so by Conception he may be said to participate of their Nature; or else that His visible and external Exercise of the Power of God, is his Divine Nature. From the first *Socinus* (whom *Biddle* reproveth for it) and *Crellius* do dissent, for they deny the Spirit to be a Person, but the Power and Efficacy of God the Father.

So that according to their opinion Christ cannot be of the Nature of Angels by conception. Nay, *Biddle* himself, though he asserts the Holy Ghost to be an Angel, and Christ to be conceived by him, yet he saith that Christ hath no other than a humane Nature. Article the 3d.

Secondly, If his external and visible Exercise of the Divine Power of God, be the external and visible Exercise of his own Nature; it is what we are pleading
ing

ing for, and if this were but granted, the main Controversy would quickly cease, for the Power of God as it is in God, is his Nature: so it must be in Christ.

But it's hard to conclude from what these Men do say, what Christ and the Holy Spirit are; for some are for having Christ nothing but Humane: and others, that He is more than a Man, *viz.* the Son of God by Conception, and yet that he is not God by Nature: So likewise *Biddle* is for having the Holy Ghost to be an Angel; others say, That he is the Power and Efficacy of God the Father: And what they will hammer forth at last, or where they will settle, who can tell? However, in this they all agree, That neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost, are God by Nature, or have the supream Divine Nature of God for their own Nature: And therefore, forasmuch as there hath been great endeavours used to suppress the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and to raze out, or so besmear the written Word of God, that we should not discern the Beauty and Excellency of the Nature of Christ, and the Holy Spirit; I shall endeavour to demonstrate the

Truth of their Deity ; and in order thereunto,

First, I shall note, that on all Hands it is agreed among Christians, that the Scriptures do distinguish and make a difference between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; and that there is but one that is personally called the Father, and but one other Chief and only Son of that Father, and also a third distinguished from both, and called the Holy Ghost, besides which there is not another that is so called, as may be collected from the following Scriptures, Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6. 1 John 4. 9. chap. 5. 7.

2 Pet. 1. 16, 17. John 6. 27. ch. 14. 26.

3 John chap. 5. 7. for there are 3 y^e bea^r record in heaven, the father, y^e word and y^e holy Ghost: and these three are one.

C H A P. II.

*Wherein is proved that there is but One God,
the Creator and Former of all Things.*

TO shew this, I shall only give a bare Citation of several Texts of Scripture, and not take up our time, in that which is so generally believed by all Persons.

Deut. 6. 4. *Hear O Israel, the Lord our
God*

the Creator of all things. 7

God is one Lord. 1 Sam. 2. 2. There is none Holy as the Lord, for there is none besides thee, &c. Isa. 46. 9. Remember the former Things of old, for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. 1 Cor. 4. 6. There is none other God but One: but to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things. 1 Tim. 2. 5. For there is but one God, &c. Jain. 2. 19. Thou believest there is but one God, thou dost well. Nehem. 9. 6. Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; Thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Hosts, the Earth and all Things that are therein, the Sea and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all, and the Host of Heaven worshippeth thee. Psal. 86. 9, 10. All Nations whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy Name: For thou art great, and doest wondrous Things, thou art God alone. Isa. 44. 6. Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. Ver. 24. I am the Lord that maketh all Things. Isa. 45. 18. For thus saith the Lord, that created the Heavens, God himself that formed the Earth and made it: He hath established it, He created

8 *A Plurality of Divine Persons.*

it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited, I am the Lord, and there is none else.

There are many other Scriptures of like import, but these are plain and sufficient Testimonies to prove that there is but one God the Creatour and Former of all Things.

CH A P. III.

Sheweth that there is a Plurality of Divine Subsistences.

First, from *Gen. 1. 1. In the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth.* The word in the Hebrew is [*Elohim*] Gods, or Almightyes, in the Plural Number : I find an Exposition of this Text by Mr. *William Streat*, which because it giveth much Light, I shall present the Reader with the material part of it.

“ The Author reads [*אלהים*]

“ the Almightyes, and in
“ Page 2. speaking of

*In Mr. William
Streat's Book cal-
led, The dividing
of the Hoof. Pag. 1.*

“ the opposition of *Elo-*

“ *him*, Almightyes, which

“ is a Noun Plural to the

“ word *Bara*, he created, says thus ; God's

“ Phrase

A Plurality of Divine Persons. 9

“ Phrase, in a Dialect of his own, transcending all humane Arts, purposely to amaze them in the Mystery of the Trinity, is one Thing.

“ Mans ordinary means of discovering earthly Things by Grammatical Rules in humane Learning, is another.

“ This Hebraism is not used by *Moses* (the Almightyes Secretary) *Penman* of sacred Truth, joyning a Verb Singular to a Noun Plural, for Contradiction, but for Interpretation. Therefore the word *Bara* [he created] is most fittingly and significantly joyned to a Noun Plural, *Elohim*, Almightyes ; because titling himself in a Plural Number, he might give us to understand a Plurality of Persons, which are the three Persons in the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; who wrought together in the Work of Creation. And the Author further adds (*Page 3.*) that the Holy Trinity is here to be understood ; and that because the word *God* is not to be found in the Singular Number *El*, nor in the Dual as *Elohim*, but in the Plural *Elohim*, as comprehending the three Persons in the Deity. But some may say that the word.

10 *A Plurality of Divine Persons.*

Elohim, proves rather three Gods, than three Divine Persons in one Godhead. But note, that this is corrected by the Verb Singular, which betokens the Three to be One in Essence. And surely there is something in this Hebraism, because it answers so well to that which follows, *ver. 26. And God said, Let Us make Man in Our Image, after Our Likeness, &c*: Mark the words [Us] and [Our] signify more than One Person: And though some may object that the Angels are here to be understood; yet this cannot be, for the Works of Creation were never attributed to any Creatures. And as there are other Texts, *Gen. 20. 13. and ch. 35. 7. Josh. 24. 19. 2 Sam. 7. 23.* see the Dutch-Annotations, in which the Hebrew word (*Elohim*) Almighty is found in the Plural Number, as likewise the word [Makers] *Job 35. 10. Eccles. 12. 1.* So also in our English Translation, there is a Concurrence in several other places of Scripture, with this of *Gen. 1. 26.* as in *ch. 11. 7.* where the Lord said, *Go to, let us go down, and there confound their Language.* And *Isa. 6. 8.* The Lord said, *Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? &c.* Which places

ces denote a Plurality of Persons in the Godhead.

C H A P. IV.

Asserteth the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ by his Names.

THAT the Father is God, is universally owned by all Christians. And therefore,

Having made some little Preparation, I now come to prove the Deity of the Son of God. That our Lord Jesus Christ is not only Humane; but that he is also of the very same Spiritual Essence, Nature and Substance of God the Father. And,

First, I shall take notice of those Names or Appellations, which are given to our Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Scriptures; for he is frequently called by those Names which are properly applicable to none but God; As, *Mighty God*, *Isa.* 9. 6, 7. applied to Christ, *Luk.* 1. 31, 32, 33. *Most Mighty*, *Psal.* 45. 1 to 8. applied to Christ, *Heb.* 1. 8. *Almighty*, *Rev.* 1. 8. with *ver.* 17, 18. *Jehovah*, *Jer.*

23. 5, 6. These are proper Names of God, and are applied to Jesus Christ, who is often called God in the Holy Scriptures, as *John 20. 28. My Lord, and my God*: and *Heb. 1. 8. But unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever. Rom. 9. 5. Whose are the Fathers, and of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came; who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.* And though others may be called Gods, Yet unto us there is but one God, *1 Cor. 8. 6.* And what ever some may think (that would* turn the current of Scripture another way) yet I cannot conceive that Jesus Christ should be so frequently called, by the highest Appellations God hath, in a relative Sense only, and not as proper Names belonging to him, as a Person subsisting in the same Nature; nor do I believe that his Name *Immanuel*, which is, God with us, *Matth. 1. 23.* was given to him but as a suitable and descriptive Name, of both his Natures, as real God in our Nature; He took Flesh upon him, *Heb. 2. 16.* and *Phil. 2. 6, 7. He thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, &c.* Here are the two Natures of Christ

Christ asserted, his Divine Nature, which only can be equal with God, and his Humane, both which do appropriate his Name *Immanuel* to him : and if his Names are proper to the Nature of God, we must then either admit of Jesus Christ to be of the same Nature, or deny his Names to be proper to him.

Secondly ; I shall prove the Deity of the Son of God, by three particular Scriptures, that relate to God in the Old Testament, and which are applied to Jesus Christ in the New : whereby it may appear, that (respecting his Divine Nature) he is one and the same with God.

First Scripture is *Zech. 14. 3. Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those Nations, as when he fought in the day of Battel. Ver. 4. And his Feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the East, &c. Ver. 5. And the Lord my God shall come, and all the Saints with thee.* This Text, for its natural Affinity with the rest of the Chapter, cannot be allegorized without gross Absurdity ; but must be taken in a literal Sense, of the coming of Christ with all his Saints. And it well agrees with what the Angel told the Disciples, saying, *that this*

14 God in the Old-Testament,

this same Jesus which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into Heaven. Then returned they to Jerusalem from the Mount called Olivet. This sheweth that Christ ascended into Heaven from the Mount of Olives, and that thither he shall descend again; and so it agrees with the Prophet. And as to the coming of the Saints, with the Lord, or Jehovah God; this also is applied to Jesus Christ. 1 Thess. 4. 14. For if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again: even so them also which sleep in Jesus, shall God bring with him. chap. 3. 13. At the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his Saints. So that he who is by the Prophet Zechariah called the Lord God, is by the Apostles called Jesus Christ.

Second Scripture is Zech. 12. 10. And I will pour upon the House of David, and upon the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of Grace and of Supplication, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, &c.

First, The Holy Ghost speaketh of Christ in different Persons, viz. [Me] and [Him] to betoken his different Natures of God and Man, who being both, may be differently spoken of as a Person relating to either Nature. Se-

Secondly, This is confirmed by *John*, *Rev.* 1. 7. in appling the same to Christ only. And our Lord himself speaks of this great Mourning; *When they shall see the sign of the Son of Man in Heaven, coming with Power and great Glory.* *Mat.* 24. 30. So then (as it is apparent that the Prophet *Zechariah's* *Jehovah*, or Lord, in *ver.* 1. which stretcheth forth the Heavens, and layeth the Foundation of the Earth, and formeth the Spirit of Man within him, is that [Me] whom they have pierced, and Him they shall look upon and mourn for, viz. *Jesus Christ in the New Testament*.) we must either admit Christ to be of the Divine Essence, or else confound the two Testaments.

Third Scripture is *Isa.* 8. 13. *Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself, and let him be your Fear, and let him be your Dread.* *Ver.* 14. *And He shall be for a Sanctuary; but for a Stone of Stumbling, and for a Rock of Offence to both the Houses of Israel, for a Gin, and for a Snare to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem.*

This Text is applied to *Jesus Christ* in *1 Pet.* 2. 6. *Wherefore also it is contained in the Scriptures, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief Corner-Stone, elect, precious; and he that believ-*

eth

eth on him shall not be confounded. And this Corner Stone, which is Jesus Christ, as the preceding Verses shew, *is a Stone of Stumbling, and a Rock of Offence, &c. ver. 8.* So that comparing these two Scriptures together, they demonstrate Jesus Christ the Metaphorical Stone of Stumbling, and Rock of Offence, in the New Testament, to be the Lord of Hosts [*Himself*] in the Old, *viz. Jehovah*, for so is the Word Lord in the Hebrew, in all the aforesaid places in the Old Testament; which is an Essential Name of God, *Whose Name alone is Jehovah*, Psal. 83. 18. And therefore the Son of God is Co-essential with the Father.

Thirdly, I shall prove the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ by seven particular Scriptures.

First is, *Rev. 22. 6. And the Lord God of the Holy Prophets, sent his Angel to shew unto his Servants the things which must shortly be done. Ver. 16. I Jesus have sent mine Angel, to testify unto you these things in the Churches. With Chap. 1. 1. The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his Servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his Angel unto his Servant John.*
God,

God, viz. the Father, Rev. chap. 4. and chap. 1. 5, 6, 7. with chap. 3. 21. gave the Revelation to Jesus Christ; and its said, He, not the Father, sent his Angel, to signify it unto his Servant John; and this Jesus Christ is the Lord God of the Holy Prophets. And therefore he is the true Supream God by Nature.

The Second Scripture is *Acts* 20. 28. Take heed therefore unto your selves, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood. 1st. The Blood that purchased or redeemed us, is the precious Blood of Jesus Christ, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. 2^{dly}. If Jesus Christ were but a Man, tho only made of a Woman, yet being the Seed, the Off-spring of the Flesh of David, *Acts* 2. 30. *Rev.* 22. 16. the Person of a Man, his Blood would be the own proper Blood of that Person; and so it could not have such a special Relation unto God: but as he was no Person, but by the assumption of the Divine Nature; so his Blood hath a special Relation (tho not natural) unto that Nature as it is part of Christ's Person, and without which he did not exist. Now this Blood, which is the Blood of Christ, being the own Blood of God, shews the assumption-

assumption of Humanity by his own Nature; and the like may be said of the Life which God laid down for us, *1 John 3. 16.*

Third Scripture is *Phil. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8.* *Let this Mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of Men. And being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross.*

First; In this Scripture Christ is said to be in the form of God, which is not only as Man by Creation, who beareth something of his Image in the natural Qualities of the Soul, but in equality with God; so that in Nature he is not inferior to him, and therefore he can be no Creature: For there is no Creature that hath its being from God, can be equal to God.

Secondly; the Divine Nature of Jesus Christ must be understood by his being in the Form of God; because he did pre-exist his Incarnation in that Form: his Condescension of mind, and his Power in that form, to take the form of a Servant,

vant, went before his actual Condescension in taking our Nature. *Let this Mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus. Who being in the form of God — made Himself of no Reputation.* Which must be understood of our Lord Jesus Christ's subsisting in his Divine Nature before his Incarnation, in the form of God, and equal to Him.

4th Scripture, is *John 5. 26. For as the Father hath Life in Himself, so hath he given to the Son to have Life in Himself.*

First, For the Son to have Life in Himself, is not to receive it from an higher Nature, for then he would have it in another, as Fellow-Creature with us, whose Nature and Personality have their Life and Being in God: But to have Life in Himself, is to have it in his own Nature, which cannot be if he were only Humane. *Acts 17. 28.*

Secondly, For the Son to have Life in Himself, given or communicated to Him by the Father, denoteth the great Mystery of his eternal Generation in the Divine Nature; for else the manner of Speech would be absurd, and contradictory in it self; for if it were given Him as a Creature, he could not have it in Himself, and if

if he have it in Himself, though it be given of the Father, he cannot be a Creature ; for that Nature which hath Life in it self, must needs be the Nature of God, and this is the Nature of the Son.

Fifthly ; *John 10. 30. I and my Father are One.* This Text cannot simply be understood, as if Christ and the Father were One only, even as we are one in Them : for Christ, speaking of his Sheep in the 27, 28, and 29, *Verses*, says, *My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's Hand.* Here Christ asserteth the greatness of his Father's Power, that he was greater than All, but yet saith, *I and my Father are One* ; as if Christ should say, As my Father is greater than all, So also I am greater than all ; and his being One in Power, shews him to be One in Nature with him. And thus the Jews understood our Lord, when they took up Stones to stone him, *ver. 31.* that he being a Man, made himself God, *v. 34, 35, 36.* But Christ reproves their rashness in charging him with Blasphemy, looking on it as great Indignity, not to allow him any Supremacy above others they called Gods ; in that they said of him, whom
the

the Father had sanctified, — *Thou blasphemest, because he said, I am the Son of God.* I question not but the Jews would have born it well enough, though he should have assumed the Name of God, so it were in the Sense of their Law, like other Men, *ver. 34, 35.* or of a Son of God, as they themselves being Children of *Abraham*, claimed God to be their Father: But their great quarrel with Christ was, that he so affirmed Himself to be the Son of God, as one and the same with the Father, equal to him in Power; and therefore he is of the same Nature.

Sixth Scripture is *1 John 5. 20.* *And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding, that we may know him that is True: And we are in him that is True, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal Life.*

What can be more plain to prove that the Son of God is the true God, than to have it so asserted of him? and can he be the true God, and not so by Nature, the very God, and but a Creature? If so, we must then acknowledg two Gods, the One the true God the Creator, the other the true God a Creature, which is repugnant to the Scripture: for there is none
other

other God but One; for though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) But to us there is but one God, as before was shewed, 1 Cor. 8. 4, 5, 6. And Gal. 4. 8. there is an Exclusion of all from Divine Worship that are not God by Nature; and therefore if our Lord Jesus Christ be the true God, he must then be of the One true Natural Godhead.

Seventh Scripture is *Coloss. 2. 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead Bodily.*

First; To imagine from this, or any other Scripture, that the Humane Nature of Christ comprehends the Deity, is to conceive in our Minds, that of God which is inconsistent with his Immensity and Infinity of Nature. Or,

Secondly, To say that the three Divine Persons in the Godhead, do personally and equally after the same manner tabernacle in the Humane Nature of Christ; makes it common to all the three Subsistencies; so that the Father and the Holy Spirit, as well as the Son, would be incarnate: But this is contrary to the written Word of God, which declares to

us, the Son of God who is the brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person, that laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. That He it is that took Flesh upon him. *Heb.* 1. 1, 2, 3, 8, 10. and *ch.* 2. 14, 16. And all that Christ did by way of Atonement for us, and Reconciliation of God to us, is ascribed to him as the Person of the Son of God only, and not as the Father, or the Holy Ghost, though in the Unity of Nature they cannot be excluded. But,

Thirdly, If we are neither to understand this Scripture, as if the Godhead were comprehended in Christ's humane Nature; nor that the three Divine Persons were equally incarnate, what then can be further proposed as the meaning of it? But that the Person of the Son, or the Divine Nature of Christ subsisting in the one whole Nature of God, hath all the fulness of that Nature dwelling in him, for there is no Division of the whole Nature of God, with all its Essential Properties and Perfections from the Divine Persons: for then neither the Nature nor the Persons could be Infinite or Immenfurable, but limited and subscribed; and therefore there is a necessity that

that every Divine Person should have the whole Divine Nature with all the Essential Attributes and Perfections of it, whether it be Omnipotency, Omnipresency, Omniscieny, Immensity, Eternity, Goodness, &c. the fulness of all is in every Divine Person : they differ not in Nature, but in personal Properties : as the Father is not begotten like the Son, neither did the Son beget like the Father, nor also did either of them proceed like the Holy Spirit ; and so also in Office they differ the one from the other ; but in Nature they are the same, and have all the same Essential Properties and Perfections, as was said before.

So then all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily or substantially in the Person of the Son, that is, he hath the whole Spiritual Substance or Essence of the Divine Nature, and by his hypostatical Union with the Humane Nature, the fulness of the Godhead may be said also to dwell Bodily in the Humane Nature of Christ. So then, if all the Attributes and Perfections of the Nature of God in their fulness dwell in our Lord Jesus Christ, it is a sufficient and undeniable Evidence of his Deity.

But

But some may say that the Godhead dwells in Christ, after the same manner it dwells in us.

Answer. Tho it's said, that *we are the Temple of the Living God, and of the Holy Ghost that dwelleth in us, and that Jesus Christ is also in us,* 1 Cor. 6. 19. 2 Cor. 6. 16. Joh. 17. 23. Rom. 8. 9, 10. Yet what is this to that Fulness which dwells in him? We indeed have Communion with the Father and the Son, *through the Spirit,* and are made *partakers of the Divine Nature,* Eph. 2. 22. 2 Pet. 1. 4. but not after the same manner as Christ is: For the Holy Spirit hath his Union with us, by way of Fellowship with our Spirits, and unites himself in Communion with us. Phil. 2. 1. 2 Cor. 13. 14. 1 Cor. 2. 12. 1 Joh. 2. 20. whereby we are guided by the teachings of him into all Truth, Joh. 16. 13. Gal. 5. 18. But we have not our existence in the Spirit, as the Human Nature of Christ in the Divine Person of the Son; for we are distinct human Persons before, and after we are regenerated. But Christ did not exist but by Conception in the Divine Nature, in which he had his Being, and thereby a relation, by virtue of the Hypostatical Union of the Son of God with
C his

his Human Nature, to all the Attributes and Perfections of the Divine Nature. And tho it's said, that God the Father, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit dwelleth in us; yet I cannot find it was ever said, that the fullness of the Godhead, or of the Nature of God, dwelleth in us: So that this Objection is of no force, to overthrow the sufficiency of this Scripture to prove the Deity of Jesus Christ.

Fourthly; The Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, is proved by his Eternity; and as a Preparative hereunto, I shall first shew that he preexisted his Incarnation.

And, First, from *Heb. 2. 16.* *For verily he took not on him the Nature of Angels; but he took on him the Seed of Abraham.* In the Margent of some of our English Bibles, it is read, *He taketh not hold of Angels, but of the Seed of Abraham taketh he hold.*

First; This could not respect the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, for they were not such when he first took hold of them.

Secondly; Nor is this *taking hold* to be understood only of the Posterity of *Abraham*, or literal People of the Jews; because

cause this is but a light thing to the Salvation of the Gentiles, *Isa.* 49. 6. And besides, it is put in opposition to the nature of Angels, to that of ours; and therefore his *taking hold*, or *taking on him the Seed of Abraham*, is a taking his Flesh upon him, *ver.* 14. *Forasmuch then as the Children are partakers of Flesh and Blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.* So that this Text of Scripture hath a special relation to his Incarnation; and in that he took on him the Seed or Flesh of *Abraham*, it sheweth that he not only came forth of his Loins, but that he did preexist the taking hold of that Seed; for he that taketh hold of a thing must needs preexist that act of taking hold.

The Second Scripture to prove the pre-existency of Jesus Christ to his Incarnation, is *Dan.* 9. 17. *Now therefore, O our God, hear the Prayer of thy Servant, and cause thy Face to shine upon thy Sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake.*

As we cannot reasonably imagine that this Lord should be any other than *David's* Lord, *Psal.* 45. 11. with *Matth.* 22. 42, 43, 44. *viz.* the Son of God: So also there is as little ground to believe, that the Prophet should implore the fa-

your of God, for the sake of one not in being : Because it would have been more proper for him to have prayed to God for the sake of his own gracious Promise of Mercy, than for his sake, who was fore-appointed of God to make an Atonement for our Sins, if he were not then existing in his Divine Nature. For as there could be no Promise on Christ's part, to undertake and perform the work of Atonement for us, whereby to ingage the Father to shew us Mercy ; so neither could God be engaged for the sake of one that was not then in being, to do or promise the performance of any Mercy. And therefore I humbly conceive, that from the Prophet's Prayer to God for the Lord's sake, we may conclude that the Son of God (for whose sake alone our Sins are forgiven) did then exist.

Third Scripture is, *Phil. 2. 6, 7. Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God : But made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of Men.* These Words do shew, that Jesus Christ was not made of no reputation by another, but that he made himself so. Whence note, he did preexist his

his Disreputation, and that in the form of God, and equal to him: For if he was not (before he took the form of a Servant) in greater Dignity, how then could he make himself of no Reputation? So that it's evident our Lord Jesus Christ did preexist his Incarnation.

Fourth Scripture is *John* 1. 30. where the Evangelist saith, *This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a Man which is preferred before me, for he was before me.* As *John* was conceived at least six Months before Christ; so also he began his Ministry before him: for Christ was Baptized by him, and he did not preach the Gospel, till after *John* was put in Prison, *Luk.* 1. 35, 36. *Mark* 19. 14. *Mat.* 4. 12, 18. And therefore seeing that *John* was before Christ, both in his Conception, and Ministry, wherein then was Christ before him but in his Divine Nature?

But if it should be said, that Christ was before *John* in the Purpose and Decrees of God? It may be answered; That the Purposes and Decrees of God are as eternal as God Himself: and to admit of any real or absolute Precedency of any thing in God, is repugnant to his infinite, eternal, and immutable Per-

30 *Christ is no Angel Incarnate.*

fection, and makes Him subject to Accidents. So that it's undeniable our Lord Jesus Christ did preexist his Incarnation. But not in the Nature of Angels.

First, For though the Nature of Angels is more excellent than Mans, yet neither for their excellency of Nature, nor any work it is capable of, could the proper Works, Attributes and Perfections of God be ascribed to it : for no Creature can be equal to the Creator, or have equal Attributes and Perfections to him : and therefore whatsoever is or may be applied to Christ, from the Word of God that is proper to the Holy Deity, could not be applied to him, if his Nature were not better and more excellent than the Angels.

Secondly ; The Apostle *Paul* in the first and second Chapters to the *Hebrews*, largely discourses this Matter, and sufficiently proves that Christ is no Angel. First, from chap. 1. 4. *Being made so much better than the Angels, as he hath by Inheritance obtained a more excellent Name than they.* This Text doth not import, that only Christ's Name, obtained by the Inheritance of his Kingly or Priestly Office, is more excellent than the Angels, but also

Christ is no Angel Incarnate. 31

so that his Nature is different from theirs : for the Apostle speaks not of Christ and the Angels, in such words or form of Speech, as might any ways intimate both Him and Them to be of the same Nature : as if he should say, that Christ had obtained a more excellent Name than the *rest* of the Angels had ; but so as to demonstrate that Christ is no Angel : for his Speech is comprehensive of all the Angels, of their whole Nature ; and excludes the Son of God from their Number. And this the Apostle insists farther upon, in the *5th* and *13th Verses* of this Chapter : For after he had told us what the Son of God is, *viz.* That he is the brightness of his Father's Glory, and the express Image of his Person, *ver. 3.* and that he is made better than the Angels, *ver. 4.* he moreover saith, *For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten Thee ?* And again, *To which of the Angels said he at any time, Sit on my Right Hand until I make thine Enemies thy Footstool ?* No, it was to no Angel, but to the Son ; who for his excellent Nature, above that of the Angels, is called God, *ver. 8.*

Secondly ; From *chap. 2. 16.* *For verily he took not on Him the Nature of Angels, but He took on Him the Seed of Abraham.* This is meant of his Incarnation, as the 14th Verse (which relates to this) more fully shews ; and then if His assuming our Nature, is put in opposition to his taking on Him the Nature of Angels, it is a clear Demonstration, that he preexisted his Incarnation, in some other Nature than either of these: And to imagine that the Holy Apostle, who wrote by the Holy Ghost, should affirm, that the Son of God did not assume the Nature of Angels, if he had before existed in it, would be an Imputation of Absurdity to him, yea to the Holy Ghost, which is Blasphemy. From all which it is apparent, that Christ did not preexist his Incarnation in the Nature of Angels, but, as it must follow, in the Divine Nature of God.

Secondly ; I come to prove the Deity of the Son of God by his Eternity.

First Scripture is, *John 1. 1.* *In the Beginning was the Word.* First, this Text is not to be understood of the preaching of the Gospel by Jesus Christ, or *John*
the

the Baptist, for this was not a Mystery fit to be set as a frontice-piece to *John's* Book, nor is there any such Intimation in the Words; and therefore it preceded that beginning. Secondly; He speaks of that Beginning in which all Things were created, *ver. 3.* which shews that he did not only precede the preaching of the Gospel, but the beginning of the Creation, and therefore he was from all Eternity.

Second Scripture is, *Isa. 9. 6. Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and his Name shall be called — Everlasting Father,* or Father of Eternity, as is confessed by our Adversaries: If we read *ver. 7.* and compare it with *See Biddle's Confess. Article 3.* *Luke 1. 31, 32, 33.* we may see, that this Text is applied to our Lord Jesus Christ; and if he be the Author of Eternity, he must Himself be Eternal.

Third Scripture is, *Col. 1. 17. And he is before all things.* And so as that (*in ver. 16.*) *All things were created by Him in Heaven and Earth, visible and invisible;* which could not be said of Christ, unless he were the Eternal God, existing from all Eternity.

Fourth Scripture is, *Rev. 1. 17, 18. Fear not, I am the first and the last; I am He that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore.*

This Scripture cannot be applied unto any other but Jesus Christ, who was dead, and is alive again; for though it was the Angel that spake, yet it was as representing the Person of Jesus Christ; and therefore whatsoever he saith in his own Person, must be applied to him; and this is manifested in *ver. 8. I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* And in *ch. 2. 8.* where the Angel speaks the same words, but not in the same Person he did before, saying, *And unto the Angel of the Church in Smyrna, write, These Things saith the First and the Last, which was dead, and is alive again.* Yea and in all the Epistles to the Seven Churches of *Asia*, he doth not only dictate them as from another; but also, the same Description that *John* gives of the Angel, the Angel applies to the Son of God, *ch. 2. 18.* So that these Words, *I am the First and the Last*, do relate unto Jesus Christ: and as nothing can be first or preexist the Creation

ation, but the Divine Nature ; So our Lord Jesus Christ, as being the first, must preexist all things in the Nature of God.

Fifth Scripture to prove the Eternity of the Son of God is, *John 17. 5. And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with thy own Self, with the Glory which I had with Thee before the World was.* If the Son were in Glory with the Father, before the World was, he was then existing before Time, and therefore from all Eternity, Coessential with the Father.

Fifthly ; The Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is proved by his Works.

First, from *John 2. 19, 21. Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up — But he spake of the Temple of his Body.*

We read of many mighty Works that were wrought by the Holy Apostles, but not in their own Names, or by their own Power : saith *Peter, Acts 3. 12. Why look you so earnestly on us, as though by our own Power or Holiness, we had made this Man to walk ?* And *Moses*, for saying, *Must we fetch Water out of this Rock ?* was shut out of the Land of Canaan, *Num. 20. 12, 19.* For though God had given such

such power to Men ; yet he expected the Glory should be given to him alone, as the Apostles did to Jesus Christ, *ver. 16.* And surely if our Lord Jesus had not been God equal with the Father in Nature, he had offended in assuming that Power to Himself, which is to be ascribed to none but God ; Who is said *to have raised him the third Day*, Acts 10. 40. So that the same Power which is ascribed to God, the same doth our Lord Jesus assume unto himself, and this demonstrates him to be of the same Nature.

Second Scripture is, *John 1. 3. All things were made by Him ; and without Him was not any thing made, that was made.* And therefore the Word, or Son of God, *ver. 14, 18.* is the Eternal God and Creator of all Things.

Third Scripture is, *Col. 1. 16, 17. For by Him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers ; all things were created by Him, and for Him : And he is before all things, and by Him all things consist.* It is not, neither could it be said, that all things were renewed by the Son of God ; for the good Angels had no
need

need of it ; and the Devils were not, neither were Men, save only a select Number in part, but not wholly renewed ; for this cannot be until our Bodies are raised up from the Grave, and reunited unto our Souls. Nay, the whole Creation was never yet renewed, but is groaning under the bondage of Corruption, and waiting to be delivered into the glorious Liberty of the Sons of God, *Rom. 8. 19, &c.* And therefore this Scripture as it must of necessity be taken in its literal Sense, so fully asserts the eternal Power and Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, that I know not how its Authority can be evaded : for if all things were created and are upheld by him, and that because (as the Apostle gives the reason) that he was before all things ; then he must be the eternal God, Co-creator with the Father.

Fourth Scripture is, *Heb. 1. 10. And thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens were the Works of thy Hands :* The word [*And*] connexes this Verse with the preceding Words, and makes it relate to *ver. 8.* as if we should read it thus, *But unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God,*
is

is for ever and ever. And (to the Son he saith) thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. And therefore he cannot be a Creature, but the Creator of all things.

Sixthly, The Deity of Jesus Christ is proved by that Divine Worship and Adoration given to him. None but God is to be worshipped with Divine Worship; But the Son of God is to be worshipped with Divine Worship; therefore he is God.

First, to prove the Major in *Matth. 4. 10. It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* And *Rev. 19. 10. ch. 20. 8.* In both which places, when *John* fell down to worship the Holy Angel, he was forbidden, saying, *See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-Servant: worship God.* And *Gal. 4. 8. Howbeit then when ye knew not God, ye did Service unto them which by nature are no Gods.* And *Isa. 42. 8. I am the Lord, that is my Name; and my Glory will I not give to another, &c. And chap. 48. 11. For my own sake, even for my own sake will I do it, for how should my Name be polluted? and I will not give my Glory unto another.*

Now

by Divine Worship given to him. 39

Now from these Scriptures, there is an Exclusion from Divine Worship of all that are not God by nature; and none is to be glorified, or worshipped with the same Glory or Worship which belongs to God, but Himself only.

Secondly, to prove the *Minor*; That the Son of God is to be worshipped with Divine Worship, *Matth. 14. 33. Then they that were in the Ship, came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God.* So in *ch. 2. 11. The wise Men worshipped him: In chap. 8. 2. The Leper worshipped him: And in ch. 28. 17. The Disciples worshipped him:* and in many other places he was worshipped, and he never forbad any. And therefore we have good reason to believe that it was due unto him as God: For when *Cornelius* fell down to worship *Peter*, he took him up and said, *Stand up, I my self also am a Man.* And so also in *Rev. 19. 10. and ch. 20. 8. when John* fell down to worship the Holy Angel, he was forbidden saying, *See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren: worship God.* So likewise if Christ had not been God by nature, he would not have suffered his Disciples and others to have worshipped

shipped him, without rebuke for it. But to proceed.

There are other Scriptures of greater force, to prove that the Son of God is to be worshipped with Divine Worship; as *Heb. 1. 6.* And again, when he bringeth the first-begotten into the World, he saith, And let all the Angels of God worship him. And *Rev. 5. 8, 9.* The four Beasts, (or rather four living Creatures,) and four and twenty Elders, fell down before the Lamb (*viz.* Christ, *John 1. 29.*) having every one of them Harps and golden Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of Saints. And they sang a new Song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the Book, and to open the Seals thereof: For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy Blood, &c. *Ver. 13.* And every Creature which is in Heaven, and on the Earth, and under the Earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, Blessing and Honour, and Glory and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. *Ver. 14.* And the four Beasts (or living Creatures) said, Amen, even so, Amen. *Ch. 7. 9.* After this I beheld, and lo, a great number which no Man could number of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and

by Divine Worship given to him. 41

and Tongues, stood before the Throne, and before the Lamb, and cryed with a loud Voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb. So that our Lord Jesus Christ is counted worthy of the same Divine Worship by all Creatures in Heaven and Earth, as God the Father, and hath the same Power as well as Honour and Glory ascribed to him.

Thus I have proved both the *Major* and the *Minor*; viz. that none but God is to be worshipped with Divine Worship.

That the Son of God is to be worshipped with Divine Worship, and the Conclusion follows, therefore he is God.

To what I have said, by way of positive proof, touching the Deity of Christ, I shall not further add, for there hath been given plentiful and sufficient Evidences from the Word of God, that our Lord Jesus Christ has undeniable marks of the Divine Nature upon him; so that his Deity cannot be denied without subverting the Holy Scripture, which gives him the same Names, proves his Eternity, renders the same Worship, attributes the same Works, and asserts him the same as God the Father. And if we cannot know
him

him as God by these Marks, by what can we know him then? And if these be insufficient, how shall we know God the Father? For if the chiefest Marks of the Divine Nature that are found on our Lord Jesus Christ, be no proof of his existing in the same Nature; we may then question the Deity of God the Father, who is only known and distinguished from all Creatures by these and the like Attributes given to him, and Descriptions of him. So that I see no way to escape the powerful convincing Testimonies of this Truth, if there be but a searching after it, unless we deny the Authority of the Holy Scriptures.

C H A P. V.

Wherein is proved the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

AS the Scriptures have given a clear Testimony to the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ; so also they will afford us sufficient Evidence of the Deity of the Holy Spirit, which I intend to demonstrate in this Chapter. And,

First,

First, I shall prove that the Holy Spirit is a Divine Person, and not a Quality in God.

First, Our Lord Jesus Christ speaks of the Holy Ghost as a Person, *John* 14. 16, 17. *And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: Even the Spirit of Truth, whom the World cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: But ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.* Chap. 16. 8. *And when he is come, he will reprove the World of Sin.* Ver. 13. *Howbeit when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth: for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.* In these Scriptures the words [*He, Him, and Himself*] are used to the Holy Spirit, and these all do note him to be a Person, and not a Quality.

Secondly, He is called *the Comforter*, *John* 16. 7. which is a personal Name.

Thirdly, He is put in the same rank with other Divine Persons, as a Person, *Matth.* 28. 19. *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy*

Holy Ghost. 1 John. 5. 7. *For there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.* Now from these Texts of Scripture, I shall make these three Observations.

First, That we may as well say, that the Father, and the Son are Qualities, as the Holy Spirit. And,

Secondly, The baptizing in the Name of the Spirit, denotes him to be a Person, as well as the Name of the Father and the Son, by their Names are so denoted.

Thirdly, He cannot be a Quality; for if the Word and the Holy Ghost be Qualities, and the Father only a Person; or else the Father and Word Persons, and only the Holy Ghost a Quality, yet the three can neither be one Person, nor one Quality.

Fourthly, The Holy Ghost is a Person, and is so far from being a Quality in God, that he hath in himself the Quality of Knowing and Understanding: 1 Cor. 2. 11. *Even so the things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God; and also of willing, John 16. 7, 8. 1 Cor. 12. 11. But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every Man severally as he*
will

will. And therefore the Holy Spirit having personal Qualities, is denoted to be a Person; and there is not the least reason to believe but that the Holy Ghost is a Person, who is so generally treated of as a Person.

Secondly, The Holy Spirit is God from the Testimony of four several Scriptures.

First, is *Matth. 28. 19. Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* If the Holy Ghost were not God, why should we be baptized into his Name, and ascribe unto him a share in the Work of Man's Salvation? But that as the Father was pleased to elect and ordain the Son to lay our Iniquities upon him, and accept us in him; and as the Son was willing (as it were) to disrobe himself of the Glory he had before the World was, to bear the Wrath of God, that was due to us for our Sins, that we might be delivered from it; and to reconcile him to us by the precious Blood of his Cross: So the Holy Spirit changes our Hearts, and reconciles them to God, by infusing into us a new Nature
with

46 *The Deity of the Holy Ghost*

with Holy Dispositions and Power against Sin, which the good Angels could never do : for though they have great Power to communicate to our Spirits, and influence our Souls with good things ; yet the evil Angels having the same Power of Nature, and being first in Possession, may keep our Souls in Bondage, till one that is stronger, casts them out, *Luke* 11. 22. *1 John* 4. 4. And therefore the Holy Spirit, having so great a hand in this glorious Work, may rightly receive a share with other Divine Persons of our Acknowledgment of it, which demonstrates that the Holy Ghost is God ; for otherwise we should ascribe that Work unto the Creature which is above the Power of its Nature, and is only possible for God himself.

Second Scripture is *1 Cor.* 3. 16. *Know ye not that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you ?* To have the Spirit of God dwelling in us, is to have our Bodies the Temple of the Holy Ghost, *1 Cor.* 6. 19. And the Temple of the Holy Ghost is the same as the Temple of God ; and to say that the Temple of God is the Temple of a Creature, or to give it the Name of a Creature,

ture, is a Dishonour to it, as not sanctified unto God : And therefore the same Spirit or Holy Ghost that dwelleth in us, is God that dwelleth in us.

Third Scripture is 1 *John* 5. 7. *For there are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* This Scripture is so clear an Evidence for the Truth I am pleading for, that there have been some who would blot it out, denying its Authority to be equal with other Scriptures, which I shall answer unto in its proper place.

But whereas it is said, [*and these three are one*] it must be understood that they are one in Essence ; for in *ver.* 8. where the Essences differ, the manner of speaking also differs, [*as agree in one*] viz. in Testimony ; but in the Text it is [*are one*] viz. in Essence, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are not only one in Agreement of their Testimony, as the Blood, the Water, and the Spirit are, but are one in Essence. And this Distinction was made in the two Verses, that we might not miss of the Truth of God in them.

Fourth Scripture is, 2 *Cor.* 3. 17. *Now the*

48 *The Deity of the Holy Ghost*

the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty. Ver. 18. We are changed into the same Image from Glory to Glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord, or (as it is in the Margent) Of the Lord the Spirit. Now if the Holy Spirit were not of the same Divine Essence, it could not be said, the Lord is that Spirit.

Thirdly ; I shall shew that the Holy Spirit is God by the Works of Creation that are ascribed to him.

1st. Job 33. 4. *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me Life.*

2^{dly}. Job 26. 13. *By his Spirit he hath garnished the Heavens, his Hand hath formed the crooked Serpent.*

3^{dly}. Psalm 104. 30. *Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are Created, &c.*

4^{thly}. Gen. 1. 1. *And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters.* The Spirit did co-create with other Divine Persons, or Subsistences in the Deity : And therefore it is said, *That in the beginning Gods (or the Almightyes) created the Heavens and the Earth:* Which Words, being inclusive of more than one Person, and the Spirit of God being said to move upon

upon the Face of the Waters ; I think we may safely say, that the Holy Spirit did co-work with other Divine Persons in the work of Creation, and was one of those Persons of whom it's said, *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness, &c.* So that from these Scriptures it is clear, that the Holy Spirit did create, and therefore we cannot deny his Deity.

Fourthly ; The Deity of the Holy Spirit is demonstrated by what is ascribed to him in the Conception of our Lord Jesus, and by the Works that he accomplished, through the Power received from him.

First, Jesus Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost. *Luke 1. 34. Then said Mary unto the Angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a Man ? Vers. 35. And the Angel answered, and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall over-shadow thee : Therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. And Matth. 1. 18. Mary was found with Child of the Holy Ghost.*

From both these Scriptures it appears that our Lord Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost, the Power of the Highest,
D which

which is God. Not that any should imagine from hence, that every particular attribute in God are so many Persons in the Godhead, but essential Properties of the One most high God; and, as such, cannot be separated from him: And therefore to ascribe the Conception of Christ to the immediate Power of God, is to attribute it unto God, for all his Attributes are so many descriptive Appellations of him. And therefore seeing that the Power of the Highest is the Highest himself, and that the Holy Ghost is this Power which came upon *Mary*, and overshadowed her, then the Holy Ghost must be God. And he cannot be otherwise understood: for no created Spirit could produce a Child in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*.

Secondly, It appears that the Holy Ghost is God, by the Works that our Lord Jesus accomplished by him.

First, He was anointed with the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, *Luk. 4. 18. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, &c. — With the Oyl of Gladness above his Fellows — for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him, Heb. 1. 9. John 3. 34.*

Second-

Secondly ; Jesus Christ cast out Devils by the Spirit of God, *Mat. 12. 28.* But if I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God, then the Kingdom of God is come unto you.

Thirdly ; Our Lord Jesus offered up himself unto God through the Spirit. *Heb. 9. 14.* How much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your Consciences from dead Works to serve the living God.

Now if our Lord Jesus Christ have the same Nature in the Unity of Essence with God the Father, why should he then attribute that Power, by which he cast out Devils, and performed his Ministerial Office in preaching the Gospel, and offering himself a Sacrifice to God for us, unto the Spirit, if he were but a Creature ? For thus to exalt the Creature, would much eclipse his own Power and Glorious Deity. And therefore I cannot think, that all those glorious Things should be attributed to the Holy Spirit, unless he were a Divine Person subsisting in the Nature of God.

And forasmuch as God hath said, that *He will not give his Glory to another*, there cannot be any Colour of reason to deny

52 *The Holy Ghost's Deity proved*

the Deity of the Holy Ghost, unless we deny the Deity of Jesus Christ. And seeing that his Deity is so plainly proved, that none can deny it, if they open their Eyes to the Light of the Holy Scriptures ; and that the Deity of the Holy Ghost doth so naturally flow from it, that none can reject the one without the other ; there is ground from hence, as well as from the preceding Evidence of the Holy Spirit's Deity, to believe that he is a Divine Person in the same Nature and Essence, together equal with God the Father, and the Son.

Fifthly ; The Deity of the Holy Ghost is proved by the Divine Worship that is given to him.

As the Scriptures do demonstrate the Holy Spirit to be a Divine Person subsisting in the Nature of God ; so to worship God adequately aright, we must include the Holy Spirit : for whether we worship God indefinitely, yet as the one Nature and Spiritual Substance of God, is the Nature and Substance of each Person, we therein do worship each Person ; or whether we worship a Person by peculiar Attributions, proper to that Person ; yet
as

by Divine Worship given him. 53

as the one Nature and Substance of the Deity, is the Nature and Substance of that Person, we therein do worship the Deity: So that we can neither exclude any one Person in the worshipping of the Deity, or the Deity in the worshipping of any one Divine Person, if we know what we worship. *John* 4. 22. *ch.* 8. 19. *ch.* 14. 7, 8, 9. But,

1st. To prove that the Holy Ghost is to be worshipped with Divine Worship, I shall cite *Matth.* 28. 19. *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* What is our being Baptized in the Name of the Holy Ghost, but our Acknowledgment of our Faith in him, and our yielding of due Obedience and Worship to him, as well as to the Father and the Son?

2^{dly}. The Holy Ghost is worshipped with Divine Worship. *Isa.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10. compared with *Acts* 28. 25, 26, 27. The Prophet *saw the Lord sitting upon his Throne, high and lifted up, and his Train filled the Temple.* Ver. 2. *About it stood the Seraphims.* Ver. 3. *And one cryed unto another, and said, Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of his Glory.* And the Lord bad the Prophet,

ver. 9. Go and tell this People, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Now the same Lord that spake to the Prophet, and was worshipped by the Seraphims, is said to be the Holy Ghost in *Acts* 28. and from thence it appears, that the Holy Ghost is to be worshipped with Divine Worship, and therefore he is God.

C H A P. VI.

Wherein is proved the Unity of the Holy Trinity.

FORASMUCH as it is manifestly declared in the Holy Scriptures of Truth, that there is but one God, and that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, it must then consequently follow, that these three are but one God.

And first, this is farther shewed, and declared to us by our being Baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *Matth.* 28. 19. for as these three are ranked together as Divine Persons, so there is no reason to think

think that they should differ in their Nature, seeing we ascribe the great work of Salvation to all of them : And surely if Christ and the Holy Spirit were instrumental in our Salvation, only as Creatures under God the Father, they would not be ranked together with him as the efficient Cause : For the Holy Angels, though they are all Ministering Spirits sent forth to minister for them, who shall be Heirs of Salvation ; yet are we not required in any Church-Ordinance to acknowledg their Service in honour to them, *Heb. i. 14. 1 Cor. ii. 10.* For though we are exhorted to such a Holy Behaviour, as that we might not prevent, or disturb them in their Ministerial Work and Office, yet the Glory of all is to be given to God alone, *viz. to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost :* and the reason to me is plain, because the Angels are of a lower Nature ; otherwise it were not irrational to believe, that if the Angels were equal in Nature to Christ and the Holy Spirit, though lower in Office, they should have a share proportionable in the Attributions of Protection and Salvation. Besides, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are ranked together,

because these three only are Omniscient and Omnipresent : *Do not I fill Heaven and Earth, saith the Lord ?* not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit. For they created all things, as hath been shewed, and therefore they know all things. *He that teacheth Man Knowledge, shall not he know ?* And, *whither shall I go from thy Spirit, &c.* Or, *whither shall I flee from thy Presence, &c.* And Christ saith, *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them ;* And, *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the World.* Jer. 23. 24. Matth. 18. 20. chap. 28. 20. Psalm 139. 7 to 14. Psalm 94. 10, 11. If any say, that Christ means only, that his Doctrine shall continue among the Faithful that congregate in his Name; or, as Ephes. 3. 17. *To dwell in our Hearts by Faith, viz. in his Doctrine.* It is answered, That not simply his Doctrine as it is mixt with Faith, in its abstract from inward feeling, is here to be understood ; but some other presence of Christ with his People ; for he saith, John 14. 23. *If a Man love me, he will keep my Words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.*
Where

Where note, that to such as have already received his Word by Faith in the love of it, and keep it, he hath promised a further Presence : And what can it be, but the inward sensation or feeling of his Love ? as sometimes we have, *Rom* 5. 1 to 6. tho at other times we have not, *Job* 13. 15. ch. 23. 8 to 11. But they may further say, If this be the Presence of Christ you speak of, it is not his personal Presence, but by the Spirit, which is called the Spirit of Faith, that sheddeth the Love of God abroad in our Hearts. To this I reply, True, it is not the personal Presence of Christ, either as God-Man, or of the Divine Person of the Son, but as in and through the Spirit ; which will prove what is denied by them, *viz.* That the Holy Spirit is God, yea, and the Son also. For the Office of the Spirit is universal to all Saints, throughout the World, at the same instant time, which is beyond the power of any finite Creature ; indeed Satan deceives the World, but not by an infinite Presence, at the same time in every place, but by a finite personal going to and fro, and walking up and down in it, seeking whom he may devour, being assisted by his evil Angels,

Job 1. 7. 1 Pet. 3. 8. And as the Holy Spirit by his Office must be Omnipresent; So also the Son as well as the Father is Omnipresent, in and through the Spirit with the Saints in all places, and in and with all Persons, Places and Things whatsoever; though not by the same Ministrations or Operations, yet at the same instant Season: and as the Father is Omnipresent in and through the Spirit, so I see not the least reason why we should deny it to the Son; but understand his Presence in the same sense, seeing both are present in the Unity of the same Spirit. For, *know ye not that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* As God hath said, *I will dwell in them, and walk in them:* And he that is joined to the Lord, is one Spirit with the Father, and the Son, for the Holy Ghost is called, *The Spirit of our Father -- that speaketh in us, and the Spirit of the Son, sent forth into our Hearts, crying, Abba, Father:* And the Spirit which is upon Christ shall not depart out of his Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of his Seed — nor of his Seed's Seed, from henceforth, and for ever: and if any Man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his, and by our Communion
with

with the Holy Ghost, we have Fellowship with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, and are one in them, and they will come and make their abode with us, through that one Spirit, whereby we are joyned unto the Lord. *1 Cor.* 3. 16. *2 Cor.* 6. 16: *1 Cor.* 6. 17. *Mark* 13. 11. *Matth.* 10. 20. *Gal.* 4. 6. *Isa.* 59. 21. *2 Cor.* 13. 14. *1 John* 1. 3. *John* 17. 21. chap. 14. 23. And it is comfortable for us to believe, that greater is he that is in us, than he that is in the World, *1 John* 4. 4. Otherwise what may the Soul say when he is in trouble: Surely, I fear, that notwithstanding the fulness of the precious Promises, and the great Engagements of Christ to me, that Christ and the Holy Spirit are far from me, and are busied with other Saints, and know not my Distress; and therefore I may perish before they come to help me. But blessed be God, that hath laid help upon one that is Mighty, *Psal.* 89. 19. who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him, *Heb.* 7. 15. that knoweth all our open and secret Wants, *Rev.* 2. 23. and makes Intercession for us: And as for the Holy Spirit, our Bodies are the Temple of the Holy Ghost that dwelleth in

in us, that abides with us for ever ; though his Operations may sometimes cease, when he is grieved by us ; 1 *Cor.* 6. 19. *John* 14. 16. So that the Holy Ghost is not as one that cometh but now and then to visit our Souls, but he makes his constant abode in us, and so is always ready to mortify and sanctify our vile Natures, and make them meet to have Fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, 1 *Jo.* 1. 3. And this is a Christian's Mercy, that as none is able to pluck him out of Christ's Hands, so the greatest Corruptions are not able to withstand the powerful Sanctifyings of the Holy Spirit. Satan may withstand an Holy Angel of God ; for his Fall doth not deprive him of the natural Power of an Angel : but yet he cannot withstand Christ nor the Holy Spirit, because of the Potency of their Nature, *John* 10. 28, and 30. *Rom.* 8. 13. 2 *Cor.* 10. 4 to 7. *Dan.* 10. 13. *Jude* 9. and we may say in this case, as *John* did concerning the sealed Book, *Rev.* 5. That none in Heaven nor on Earth, nor under the Earth, was found worthy besides the Son and the Holy Spirit, to redeem and sanctify the fallen Sons of *Adam* : The Angels could not do it, for they are beholden

holden to Christ for their standing,
1 *Tim.* 5. 26. But blessed be God our Savi-
our, for in him *shall all the Seed of Israel*
be justified, and shall glory, Tit. 2. 10. *Isa.*
45. 25. To whom be Glory and Praise
now and for evermore, *Amen.*

So then if we ascribe and acknowledg
the Work of Mans Salvation to the Fa-
ther, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,
which are ranked together, as the effici-
ent Cause, and therefore receive the Glo-
ry of it : and seeing both the Father and
the Son dwells in us, in and through the
Holy Spirit, whose Office in his Omnipre-
sence bespeaks his unlimited and infinite
Nature ; I cannot conceive but that the
great Unity of these three Subsistencies
should be in Essence.

Secondly ; The Unity of the Holy Tri-
nity is manifest from *Isa.* 6. 23. where
the Seraphims cried one unto another and
said, *Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of*
Hosts ; agreeable to *Rev.* 4. 8. Now here
are three Holies, viz. Holy Father, Ho-
ly Son, and Holy Ghost : and though I
do not lay the stress of the proof on the
bare repetition of the word Holy ; yet
doubtless it ecchoes to the Truth that is
couched in this Chapter, and which I hope

to demonstrate by the help of other places referring to it. And in order thereunto I shall note who the Prophet saw upon his Throne, high and lifted up, whose Train filled the Temple: And this was *Jehovah* (an incommunicable Name of God, *Psal.* 83. 19.) the Lord of Hosts, who filleth the whole Earth with his Glory, but this was not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Ghost.

1st, That it was the Father, needs no proof, because it is not denied, but confessed by our Adversaries in opposition to the other two Divine Persons.

2dly, That this Vision is applied to the Son, we have the Words of the Apostle for it, *John* 12. 41. who speaking of Christ from verse 37 to 40: and citing the Prophet *Isaiab's* Message, when he saw this Vision, saith, *These things said Isaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him, viz. of Christ, whom John was speaking of.*

3dly, This Scripture is also applied to the Holy Ghost in *Acts* 28. 25, 26. as hath been said already, and will be defended in its proper place. So that if we will credit the Holy Apostles, who were doubtless the best Expounders and Appli-

ers of dark Prophecies ; and have unfolded the Mystery of the Holy Trinity which lay hid in the Words, *Holy, Holy, Holy,* and couched in the Plurality of Persons, hinted to us in these Words, *Who shall go for us?* ver. 8. Then surely we must acknowledge that seeing the Prophets *Jehovah,* and the Apostles *Son* and *Holy Spirit,* are one and the same ; that these two are Divine Subsistencies as well as the Father, subsisting in the supream Nature of God.

Thirdly, If we couple together *John* 10. 30. and *2 Cor.* 3. 17. *I and my Father are one.*—*The Lord is that Spirit ;* we may see that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are but one God.

Fourthly, *John* gives so clear a Testimony to the Unity of the Holy Trinity, that I know not how it can be denied, *1 John* 5. 7. *For there are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one in Essence, as was shewed before.*

64 *Of the Essential Being of God.*

C H A P. VII.

Containeth some Explications of the Holy Trinnity.

F*irst*, Of the essential Being of God.
God is one single, infinite, eternal, immense, perfect, spiritual Being, no Compound, for Compounds must be either finite or infinite; not of Finites, for Finites are imperfect, temporal and mensurable, and so cannot make one infinite perfect Being; not of Infinites, for more than one infinite Being cannot subsist, for one infinite Immensity cannot admit of another infinite Immensity, nor is infinite Perfection exclusive, but comprehensive of all Perfection.

Hence it is that we must not imagine God to have any shape, because an Infinite Being cannot be any ways limited or subscribed. *Deut.* 4. 12, 15. *John* 4. 24. *Deut.* 33. 27. *Psal.* 147. 5. *Psal.* 90. 2.

Secondly, Of a Divine Person.

Mr. *Chynel* in his Divine Trinnity, Page 96. describes a Divine Person. "A
" Divine

“ Divine Person is a spiritual and infinite
“ Subsistent, related indeed to these o-
“ ther uncreated Persons, which subsist in
“ the same Divine Nature with it, but
“ distinguished from those co-essential
“ Persons, by its peculiar manner of Sub-
“ sistence, Order of subsisting, singular
“ Relation and incommunicable Proper-
“ ty.

Thirdly, Of the Divine Person of the Father.

The Divine Person of the Father is unbegotten, and subsists of himself in the Divine Essence, and hath the Divine Nature of none.

Fourthly, Of the Divine Person of the Son.

The Divine Person of the Son is naturally and necessarily begotten of the Father, by eternal Generation, for he is Eternal, as hath been shewed, and is of the Father, *John* 5. 26. by eternal Generation, and he subsists in the unbegotten Nature of God ; for the Father did not beget the Divine Nature of the Son, but the Son is begotten in the Divine Nature.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, Of the Divine Person of the Spirit.

The Divine Person of the Spirit hath his Subsistence, naturally and necessarily both from the Father and the Son, by eternal Spiration or Emanation, *Job* 33. 4. and therefore the Holy Ghost is called the Spirit of Christ, who breathed on his Disciples, and bid them receive the Holy Ghost, to shew that the Spirit was breathed forth by him as well as from the Father, *Jahn* 20. 22. *John* 15. 26. 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. 2 *Pet.* 1. 21. not from the Father alone, or the Son alone, for then he might be said to be the Son of the Father, or of the Son, but by the Father and the Son, and not being separated or divided from either, he subsists in the same Nature, and is co-essential with them both.

Sixthly, Of the Unity of the Holy Trinity.

The Divine Nature is common to all three Subsistencies, and the whole Divine Nature is the Substance of every Person which distinctly subsists in it; and all its essential Properties pertain unto each of them, and the Divine Nature, because it
is

is infinite in Perfection, it contains all relative as well as absolute Perfections.

Seventhly, Of the Distinction between the Divine Nature and the Persons.

I shall cite Mr. *Chynel* in his Divine Trinunity; Page 105, &c.

“ First, The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do all three *really, positively, truly*, subsist in the Divine Essence; and yet these three Subsistencies, and the Divine Essence, do not make *four*, nor two *things really distinct*; even as Entity, Truth, Goodness, and Unity, do not make four things really distinct, as you heard but now, but are one real thing, and no more.

Secondly, *Ens* is not compounded of Entity, and its three Affections; nor is God compounded of the Godhead, and three Subsistencies; nor is any one Person compounded of the Divine Nature and Subsistence.

“ Thirdly, As Truth is not Goodness, nor Goodness Truth, nor either of them Unity, and yet all three are Entity: So the Father is not the Son, nor is the Son the Father, nor is either of them the Holy Ghost, and yet all three
“ are

“ are God ; for they are all three but one
 “ God, subsisting with all absolute and rela-
 “ tive Perfection, as hath been shewed.

“ Fourthly, Every one of the three
 “ Affections of *Ens*, doth connote Enti-
 “ ty : every one of the three Subsisten-
 “ cies doth connote the Godhead, the
 “ Divine Nature, as hath been proved at
 “ large.

“ Fifthly, Not any one of the three
 “ Affections of *Ens*, doth, nor do all
 “ three together, superadd a new Enti-
 “ ty ; not any one of the three Subsisten-
 “ cies doth, nor do all three together
 “ superadd a new Deity, a new Divine
 “ Nature, or Godhead : for *Ens* is one ;
 “ *Ens est trinum, non triplex, trinum &*
 “ *unum, Ens trin-unum, Deus est trinus,*
 “ *non triplex, trinus & unus, Deus trin-*
 “ *unus* ; this instance doth in some Mea-
 “ sure resemble the Mystery of the Trin-
 “ unity.

“ Sixthly, No Affection of *Ens* can be
 “ really separated from *Ens*, nor can one
 “ of the Divine Persons be separated
 “ from the Divine Nature, or the Di-
 “ vine Nature from any one of the Di-
 “ vine Persons, or any one of the Per-
 “ sons from either of the other two.

“ Se-

Divine Nature and Persons. 69

“ Seventhly, All the Affections of *Ens*
“ are distinguished, but none divided :
“ all the three Subsistencies are *distinguish-*
“ *ed*, but they cannot be *divided*.

“ Eighthly, Truth and Goodness,
“ which are two of the Affections of *Ens*,
“ are distinguished by their peculiar and
“ several Relations; Truth hath Rela-
“ tion to the Understanding, and Good-
“ ness to the Will: The Father, Son,
“ and Holy Ghost are *known* to be distin-
“ guished by their several and peculiar
“ Relations; and if it be not unreasona-
“ ble to say, that there is in Entity three
“ Affections, and two Relations in
“ *Ente simplissimo*, without any Composi-
“ tion in, or Multiplication of the
“ Entity, why should it seem unreasona-
“ ble, or at least why should it seem in-
“ credible, *that there are three Subsisten-*
“ *cies, and several Relations in the God-*
“ *head without any Composition in, or Mul-*
“ *tiplication of the Godhead?*

“ Ninthly, One Affection, nay all the
“ Affections *in abstracto*, do but inade-
“ quately represent *Ens*, unless you take
“ notice of the Entity it self, as well as
“ the three Affections. One single Sub-
“ sistence, nay all three Subsistencies *in*
“ *abstracto*,

“ abstracto, do but inadequately repre-
 “ sent God, unless you take notice of
 “ the Godhead in which they subsist;
 “ and therefore this precise Abstraction of
 “ the Subsistencies from the Divine Nature,
 “ is but an inadequate Conceit of God, as
 “ hath been demonstrated above in this
 “ very Chapter; for we must not dream
 “ of a *Trinity of Modes*, but assert and be-
 “ lieve the glorious and co-essential Trini-
 “ ty. The Father is truly God, that
 “ God who is the only true God; but
 “ the Father alone doth not adequately re-
 “ present God to us, as he is described in the
 “ Holy Scriptures.

“ It is true that the Divine Essence is
 “ by the Subsistence of the Father, ade-
 “ quately the Father; but as God is repre-
 “ sented by that Divine Subsistence only,
 “ he is not *Deus Trinus*, he is not the
 “ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; The
 “ Father alone, is not all these three Wit-
 “ nesses who are one God. And therefore
 “ the acute Socinians, with their precise
 “ Abstractions, do but suggest an inade-
 “ quate Conceit of God: That only true
 “ God, whom we worship, doth not
 “ subsist only in the Person of the Father.
 “ We worship God, subsisting with all abso-
 “ lute

Divine Nature and Persons. 71

“ *lute and relative Perfection in Father,*
“ *Son, and Holy Ghost ; for these three*
“ *are that one God, who is the only true*
“ *God, blessed for ever. This is the ade-*
“ *quate Representation of God in the Scrip-*
“ *tures of Truth. And we are resolved*
“ *to regulate all our Metaphysical Noti-*
“ *ons by the Holy Scriptures, that we*
“ *may make the highest of Sciences to*
“ *acknowledg the Supremacy of that Di-*
“ *vine Science which is no where to be*
“ *learnt but in the Word of God ; for*
“ *the purest Reason must be elevated by*
“ *the Word and Spirit of God, for the*
“ *discovery of this Mystery.*

“ *Tenthly ; These Affections of Ens*
“ *represent the manner of that Being,*
“ *which Ens hath as it is transcendently*
“ *considered ; and the three Divine Sub-*
“ *sistencies do represent that manner of*
“ *Being, which God hath as he is most*
“ *transcendently considered, namely as*
“ *subsisting, after the most glorious Man-*
“ *ner, with all absolute and relative Per-*
“ *fection.*

“ *It is the manner of a transcendent*
“ *Entity to be one, and true, and good,*
“ *and it is the manner of God's Being, to be*
“ *one God in three Subsistencies, these three*
“ *are*

“ are one single God, there is no Com-
 “ position, or Multiplication imaginable,
 “ in this single and infinite Being.

When I read this Similitude, and conceived the Light it gave into this Mystery, I thought it worth my time to convey it unto others out of this learned Author ; and I doubt not, but (if well considered) these rare Distinctions of the Divine Nature, and the Persons, will be profitable. For as the Author saith, “ When Divine
 “ Revelation hath gone before, and we
 “ have built upon that as the Ground-
 “ work and Foundation, by a serious
 “ Faith, these Metaphysical Notions may
 “ be subservient helps in a subordinate
 “ way. And if there might be so great
 “ Simplicity or Singleness in a created
 “ and finite Entity, notwithstanding
 “ there are three Affections, and two
 “ Relations which do affect that Entity ;
 “ it seemeth to me somewhat easy to be-
 “ lieve *that there are three Subsistencies in*
 “ *one infinite Godhead, without any Compo-*
 “ *sition in, or Multiplication of the single*
 “ *Godhead.*

Estwick in his Confutation of *Biddle's* Confession of Faith, Pag. 17. doth give (among other Resemblances of the Deity)

ty) an instance of the Soul and its Faculties, saying, " If they are (as *Scotus* and his Followers, *Zanchius* and *Scaliger*, and others do maintain) one thing, for then there is not a real Composition betwixt the Soul and the Faculties of it.

" Memory in the Soul is the beginning of the Knowledg begotten in it, and so it represents the Father. By Intelligence is represented the Son, because he is as Knowledg begotten of his Father. By Memory, and the Will, is represented the Holy Ghost. (This is some over-sight in the Author, or Error in the Printer: for it should be thus,) " Of Memory and Intelligence proceeds the Will, which represents the Holy Spirit, (and so it agrees with what follows;) " because he is alone produced of the Father and the Son; these are distinct, yet one in Essence. *August. lib. 15. de Trinitate, cap. 20. Radu. pag. 2. Controv. 13. Art. 2.* This Comparison (saith he) I confess is too short, for neither are the Faculties of the Soul Persons, nor doth there appear in them such a strange and wonderful manner of Production, as in

74 *The Unity of Christ's two*

“ the glorious Persons of the Blessed
 “ Trinity : This doth our Faith with
 “ Admiration apprehend, which our
 “ Knowledg cannot attain unto.
 “ To conclude (saith he) the Pre-
 “ misses shew that this great Mystery is
 “ not against Reason, though it be above
 “ Reason, &c.

Eighthly ; Of the Union of the Nature of God, and of Man, in one Person.

Of this I shall cite *Estwick* in his Confutation of *Biddle's* Confession of Faith, pag. 115. “ Suppose an Apple-
 “ Tree-grow up, into which the Branch
 “ of another Tree is ingrafted, which
 “ makes not the Tree to be of a compound or middle Nature, but causing
 “ the Branch, which being set into the
 “ Ground, might have proved an intire
 “ Tree of it self, to pertain to the Unity of the Tree into which it is im-
 “ planted, and yet retains its own Nature, and bears its own Fruit ; and as
 “ you may truly say, this Harvy-Tree
 “ is a Pippin-Tree, and this Pippin-
 “ Tree is a Harvy-Tree ; and consequently this Harvy-Tree beareth Pippin-
 “ pins,

“ pins, and this Pippin-Tree brings
“ forth Harvies. So may we say of the
“ Person of Christ, consisting of the Na-
“ tures of God and Man : The Son of
“ God, who was a compleat and per-
“ fect Person, hath added to it the hu-
“ mane Nature in the Unity of the same
“ Person ; as the Divine Nature of
“ our Saviour, notwithstanding the Per-
“ sonal Union, is not capable of any hu-
“ mane Imperfections, no more is the hu-
“ mane Nature (in that respect a finite
“ Creature) capable of any Divine and
“ infinite Perfection ; the weakness and
“ infirmity of Man was not swallowed up
“ in the Majesty of God, nor was God’s
“ Majesty in the least diminished really
“ by the Assumption of Man. The Union
“ of the Word, in regard of the Persons
“ subsistence, graciously bestowed on the
“ humane Nature, is not finite, nor the hu-
“ mane Nature infinite : and as the fore-
“ named Tree is but one, and yet has two
“ different Natures in it, and beareth
“ two kinds of Fruits ; so the Holy Son of
“ God is but one Person, and yet hath
“ two different Natures, and by them
“ performeth the distinct Operations
“ pertaining to either of them.

PART. II.

Wherein the Proof of the Holy Trinunity, in the former part of this Treatise, is defended against the chiefest Objections and Arguments of the Adversaries.

THERE are many Objections made, and of divers kinds, against this Doctrine; some against its Scriptural Proofs; and others inferred from divers Texts of Scripture, besides those which are offered against it as inconsistent to Reason. To which I shall make replies in order.

C H A P. I.

In which I shall answer those Objections I find again't the Scriptural Proofs of the Deity of Jesus Christ.

FIRST Objection unto *Gen* 1. 26. and to other Places also, which are cited to prove a Plurality of Divine Persons in the Godhead: We might by the same kind of arguing conclude, that because Christ in *Mark* 4. 30. saith, *Whereunto shall we liken the Kingdom of God? or with what comparison shall we compare it?* and *John* 3. 11. *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our Witness:* Therefore there are several Persons in Christ. And also in *Paul*, *2 Cor.* 10. 1, 2. The utmost that can be concluded from this passage in *Genesis*, is, That there was some other Person with God whom he employed in the Creation, which Person had been before mentioned by *Moses*, *Ver.* 2. with *Psal.* 104. 30. *Job* 26. 13. *ch.* 33. 4. These Scriptures do plainly intimate, that the Spirit was but the Instrument of

78 *Objections to a Plurality of*

God in creating Things, it was he only (*which he saith is an Angel:*) For had the Son of God, Christ Jesus, been also employed in creating of *Adam*, would he not have been likewise mentioned in the History of the Creation?

Answer. First, It doth not from hence follow, that because Christ and *Paul* speak of themselves, and others with them in the plural Number, that there is the same Reason to conclude, that there are several Persons in Christ, and in *Paul*, as there is for a Plurality of Persons in the Godhead; for those Texts do only shew a Plurality of Persons, not in Christ nor in *Paul*, but of Personalities abstracted from their Nature: for no created Persons as such, do subsist in their common Nature. Christ was a humane Substance abstracted from the humane Nature, in Conjunction with the Divine Person of the Son, and so he became the one Person of Christ, and might speak of himself and others, as Equals of the Humane Nature, not taking notice of the different Subsistence of their Nature.

Secondly, This doth not oppose a Plurality of Divine Persons in the Deity, but rather confirm it, for it being confessed
that

that *Gen. 1. 26, &c.* doth signify a Plurality of Persons, it must also be of Equals of the same Nature.

Thirdly, The Omission of the second Person (the Son of God) by Name, is no Exclusion of him from co-operating with the Father and the Holy Spirit in the Creation of the Word ; because Omission is not always an Exclusion : if it were, then God the Father would be excluded, when only Christ or the Holy Spirit is mentioned, as *Job. 33. 4.* and *Colos. 1. 16.* and in the Text, where the Father is as well omitted by Name as the Son ; and the Holy Spirit is only named, because he is the great Agent which proceedeth from the Father and the Son, in whom they work ; so that when it is said, *In the beginning* God (a common Name to all three Subsistencies) or Almighty (which includes all three Persons) created, we must not limit it only to the Father, Son, or Spirit, but understand it of all three Subsistencies. And in *ver. 2.* where the Person of the Spirit is mentioned, we must include the other two Divine Subsistencies, working in and by him. So that notwithstanding these Exceptions against those Scriptures that are brought

to prove a Plurality of Divine Persons in the Deity, yet they abide as sufficient Testimonies thereof. And as for his asserting the Holy Spirit to be an Angel, we have but his Word for it, which needs no farther Answer.

Second Objection. The Appellations of Christ are no Proof of his Deity, because other Persons and Things have the same Names ascribed to them.

1st. Persons; *Exod.* 4. 16. *chap.* 7. 1. *Jer.* 33. 16.

2dly. Things; *Gen.* 22. 14. *Exod.* 17. 15. *Judg.* 6. 24. *Ezek.* 48. 35.

Answer. First to *Exod.* 7. 1. with *chap.* 4. 16. we say, That there is not the same Reason to prove the Deity of *Moses*, as there is of Christ, from those peculiar and incommunicable Names of God that are given to him. 1st. Because that *Moses* is not absolutely called by this Name, as Christ is in some of the aforesaid Places, and in *Isa.* 8. 13. *Zech.* 12. 1, 10. *chap.* 14. 3, 4. but it's only said to him, I have made thee a God to *Pharaoh*, that is, *Moses* was inspired with Wisdom, and received Commission from God, to do Wonders in the Sight of *Pharaoh* and all his

his People, in his stead : The Lord not working so immediately from himself, as he did by the Hand of *Moses* ; like as *Moses* was instead of God to *Aaron* his Brother, to put Words into his Mouth, *chap.* 4. 15, 16. which place doth much open and confirm this Exposition.

2dly. To *Jer.* 33. 16. *And this is the Name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.* Mr. *Estwick* in his Answer to *Biddle's* Catechism, page 422. gives us this account of the Words :
“ The word *Name* is not in the Original ;
“ and to hint this to the Reader, it is
“ printed in lesser Letters than the rest,
“ which is the sacred Text ; nor is there
“ any Pronoun in the Hebrew which signifies [*she*] ; nor is there any Necessity
“ to read the word in the passive Signification, to translate it thus, *She shall be*
“ *called* ; but in the Holy Tongue it is
“ word for word, as *Arius Montanus* doth
“ turn it ; *And he that shall call her, is*
“ *the Lord our Righteousness* : And then
“ the Name is given to Christ ; And
“ this is confirmed by the Dutch Translation, after the same sense. And it is
“ most likely to be the true Interpretation
of it ; for as the aforesaid Author saith,

who can say of the Church, She is the Lord our Righteousness?

3dly. To Gen. 22. 14. *And Abraham called the Name of that Place Jehovah-jireh: that is, the Lord will see or provide.* This place was called so in respect to God (who had there provided a Ram for a Burnt-offering instead of *Isaac*) as a Memorial of what he had done there.

4thly. To Exod. 17. 15. *And Moses built an Altar, and called the Name of it Jehova-Nissi, that is, the Lord my Banner; which was in remembrance of God's appearing for his People against the Amalekites.*

5thly. To Judg. 6. 24. *Then Gideon built an Altar there unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah-Shalom: The Lord send Peace as a Token of the Promise of Peace, which God had made in ver. 23.*

6thly. To Ezek. 48. 35. *And the Name of the City from that Day shall be, The Lord is there: Which Scripture, as well as those foregoing, relates to the Presence and Appearance of God in some extraordinary manner in those places; and therefore as the Name Jehovah hath no proper Relation to them, so it hinders not the Proof of Christ's Deity, by those several incom-*

incommunicable Names of God, that are positively given to him as proper Names.

Objection. To those Scriptures that are brought to prove the Deity of the Son of God, being such as relate to God in the Old Testament, and are applied to Jesus Christ in the New.

What things are spoken of God under the Law, may for another reason be spoken of Christ under the Gospel, namely for the great and intimate Conjunction between God and Christ, in respect of Dominion, Power and Office, that Christ hath obtained by the Donation of God. Now if the Scriptures deliver the very same things of *Moses*, *Exod.* 32. 7. *Acts* 7. 35. and of others that are elsewhere written of God himself, when as neither *Moses* nor those others had so great Conjunction with God, as intervened between him and Christ, much more deservedly may those things which are primarily spoken of God, be accommodated to Christ, by reason of that most singular and strict Conjunction that is between them.

Ans. First, It's true, that that which is primarily spoken of God, to have brought up.

up *Israel* out of *Egypt*, or to be their Deliverer, is also spoken of *Moses*, and of the Angel, *Acts* 7. 35. the same did God send to be a Ruler and a Deliverer by the Hands of the Angel which appeared to him in the Bush. Yet how remote this is to the case in hand, let the Reader judge; for *Moses* we see plainly by the Text, is put as the third cause of *Israel's* Deliverance out of *Egypt*, as only an Instrument in the Hand of God through the Ministry of the Angel. And this agrees with the Old Testament, *Exod.* 33. 1, 2. *And the Lord said unto Moses, Depart and go up hence, thou and the People that thou hast brought up out of the Land of Egypt — And I will send an Angel before thee.* And *Psal.* 77. 20. *Thou leddest thy People like a Flock by the Hand of Moses and Aaron.* But the Case is far different with respect to the Son of God; for, as in the Old Testament it is absolutely spoken of God, so in the New it is positively applied to Jesus Christ, without such Restrictions as it is to *Moses*, &c. And though Christ hath Preheminence of Dominion and Power, &c. above others, by Donation; yet respecting only the Gift of God to him, there is no reason that those things that
are

are absolutely spoken of God in the Old Testament should be so positively spoken of Christ in the New, unless Regard were had to his Divine Essence.

Secondly, Forasmuch as those things that are primarily spoken of God in the Old Testament, are referred to Christ in the New, as the proper Subject to whom they belong ; it is a plain Demonstration of Christ's Divine Essence ; for otherwise they could not be equally applied to each of them.

Thirdly, If Christ's Supremacy in Dominion and Power were only by Gift of Deputation from God, he should not bear the supream Glory equal with him : for as it cannot consist with common Right, so God will not part with his own Glory to invest a Creature with it equally with himself, *Isa.* 42. 8. This may suffice here in Answer to those Objections, as to the Dominion and Power of Christ, received by Donation from the Father. I shall speak more distinctly to it elsewhere.

Objection. To *Acts* 20. 28. — *To feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood.* The Blood which is called [the own Blood of God]
is

is in such a way of speaking, and for such a Cause, as the Prophet saith, that he which toucheth the People of God, toucheth the Apple of God's Eye ; and it is so called for the exceeding great Conjunction that is between them, and as he is the Lamb of God.

Answer. I cannot perceive wherefore either of these Scriptures that are brought as Examples, should be an Impediment to the Text, that it should not be understood of the Union of both Natures in the Person of Christ, seeing there is not the word [*Own*] conjoyned with them, which intimates the special Affinity and Relation of the Blood of Christ unto God ; but that the Blood of Christ is called [*the own Blood of God,*] for the exceeding great Conjunction that is between them, not as the Adversaries mean, as I suppose, of the official Power and Dignity of Christ in subordination unto God, but as the Assumption of the humane Nature by the Divine Person of the Son did relate that Nature to the Divine Nature of God.

Objection. To Phil. 2. 6. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal*

equal with God : but made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men. This Equality of Christ with God, is to be extended no further than as he was in the form of God. But the form of a Thing (as appeareth by the common Acceptation of the Word, and by that following Clause, *He took upon him the form of a Servant* ; and also from these words, *Mark* 16. 12. *After that he appeared in another form unto two of them*) is something visibly and outwardly apparent, such as is neither the Essence nor Power of any Thing, but only the Exercise and Demonstration of Power : In the Exercise thereof and Demonstration of Divine Power, whereby he did Miracles, was Christ in the form of God, and equal to God ; And when it is said, *But emptied himself*, (or, as our English Translation hath it, *made himself of no Reputation* ;) this implieth that if Christ had not emptied himself of that Divine Form, he had thought it a Prey to be equal with God : Which cannot without the Implication of a Contradiction, or what is worse, of Blasphemy, be affirmed of God. But Christ had thought it Robbery, or a prey

prey to have been equal with God, in doing Miracles, if he had not laid aside the Exercise and Demonstration of Divine Power, and fallen into the Hands of his Adversaries, as a weak and vulgar Man : For unless he had done so, he had disobeyed the Commandment of God, and consequently thought his Divine Form to be a Prey, not a Gift of God, and that it was to be kept on for his own Glory, and not put off for the Glory of God.

Answer. First, It's true, that this Equality of Christ with God is to be extended no further than as he was in the form of God, but yet I do not hold with these Men : That his being in the form of God, is only the visible, outward and apparent Exercise and Demonstration of Divine Power, and not the Divine Essence or Power it self ; for the common Acceptation of the word [*Form*] cannot be limited to denote only the Exercise and Demonstration of Power without the Essence, as they would have it ; or only an artificial Figure, Draught or Shadow of any thing whereby its Likeness is represented, but also the Likeness of one Person or thing to another of the same Nature, which may have the like natural Power
and

and Properties in its own Essence; as *Adam*, who *begat a Son in his own Likeness, after his Image*, Gen. 5. 3. And, as Christ is said to be in the Form of a Servant, which was not only in outward Appearance, but in Nature and Substance, having the same natural Properties. So that if the word [*Form, Likeness, or Image*] (which are equivalent in their Significations) are used to express the Likeness of Essence of one created Person or Nature, to the Essence of another created Person; why may it not signify the Likeness of uncreated Persons in their essential Being and Power? For though the one is a Personal Likeness in their personal abstracted Being, or only natural, and the other is different to it, in that it is not in personal Properties (because the Divine Persons are not alike in Properties) but essential, as subsisting in the Unity of the same Essence; yet this hinders not the word [*Form*] of its proper Signification, when it is used to either of them; because it is extensive to represent any manner of Likeness whatsoever: And therefore as visible outward and apparent things have such forms; so the Subsistence of any one Divine Person in the Godhead can

can only be likened to another subsisting in the same Nature.

Secondly, To *Mark* 16. 12. Where Christ is said to *appear in another Form*. I reply, That it shews the Power of the Divine Nature, in representing Christ in another Form than what he was in before; but there is no reason wherefore this outward form should limit the Form of Christ in the other Text, to be only outward and visible, seeing the Word is common to signify any Form, and that the two Texts have no Relation to each other.

Thirdly, We cannot conclude from those Words, *He made himself of no Reputation*, That if Christ had not emptied himself of that Divine Form, he had thought it Robbery or a Prey to be equal with God; because the Apostle neither in this, nor in any other place of Scripture, assigns it as the Reason: And therefore, seeing their Exposition of these Words hath no other Foundation than what is imaginary in their own Conceit, we are not obliged to hearken to it.

Fourthly, Christ's emptying himself of that Divine Form, or making himself of no Reputation, was not his laying aside of the Exercise and Demonstration of Di-
vine

vine Power, which he had by Donation as Man: 1st, Because, as Man, Christ was not in the Exercise of it, when first he *made himself of no Reputation*; but was afterwards invested with it, when he took upon him his ministerial Office, and therefore could not lay aside the Demonstration of the Divine Power, before he was in the Exercise of it. 2^{dly}, Nor can it be meant of his Sufferings as a vulgar Man, because his making *himself of no Reputation* in assuming our Nature, and taking on him the Form of a Servant, preceded his Sufferings. 3^{dly}, Nor did he properly empty himself of the Divine Nature, as God, or as the Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity; for this could not be without his Annihilation: And therefore we must inquire after some other sense that may better suit with this and other Scriptures.

1. In this sense the Son of God may be said to empty himself, or make himself of no Reputation: to wit, in derogating from his own Glory, by his wonderful and inexpressible Condescension, in stooping so low to save Man, as to take our Nature into such an extraordinary Relation and Conjunction with himself, and

and that in the former Habit of a Servant. This was that which made Christ pray unto the Father, saying, *Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* It was so beneath the infinite and glorious God, to take our Nature into Community with his Nature, that his very Assumption of it was, as it were, a debasing of his Divine Nature.

2. Christ may be said to make himself of no Reputation, or to empty himself in respect to that Manifestation which he made of himself to the Sons of Men by his Works. The Son of God did not appear to us in the essential Glory of his Divine Nature; for so he dwelleth in the Light which no Man can approach unto, whom no Man hath seen, nor can see, but in the Vail of Flesh, through which he was emptied to our Appearance from those Divine Rays, that would have dazzled the Sons of Men, and have made them afraid to look upon him, lest they should be consumed; *Exod. 20. 19. 1 Tim. 6. 16.*

But yet there is something further objected against this Text of Scripture, *ver. 6. He thought it not Robbery to be equal with God.*

God. That which is equal, hath always a different Essence from that which it is equal unto, otherwise the same thing would be equal unto it self: Equals are Relatives, and consequently Opposites; If therefore Christ be equal to God, in respect of Essence and essential Properties, the Essence of Christ must of necessity be different from the Essence of God; wherefore they must either hold two Divine independent Essences, or two most high Gods, or that Christ is not the most high God.

Answer. First, If it's meant, that Equals have always a different Essence, respecting their Singularity or Personality, as being abstracted from their common Nature: This I do readily grant of created personal Beings: because such Singularities or Personalities cannot exist, but by Abstraction from their common Nature, and so must have different, singular and personal Essences, the one to the other, and (as Relates of the same Nature) are Equals. But what is this to the Deity of the Son of God? must we limit Divine Persons in the uncreated Nature, and confine them to the Parallel of created Beings? Surely the Scriptures teach us
other-

otherwise, that the Divine Persons are not abstracted from the Divine Nature, but are coessential, yet differing in personal Properties. Christ is equal to God, (*viz.* the Father) not respecting the same personal Properties, as to beget, &c. But essentially considered, as subsisting in the Unity of the same Nature, and having all the essential Properties of that Nature coequal with him. And thus there is neither two Divine independent Essences, nor most high Gods, but one only, subsisting in three Divine Persons, each of which subsisting in the Divine Nature, and mutually in one another, is the most high God.

Objection. To 1 John 5. 20. *And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ: this is the true God, and eternal Life.* These Words [*This is the true God*] cannot be referred unto Christ, not as if he were not [true God] but because he is not [the true God] that is here spoken of, as the Article added in the Greek doth intimate. Neither doth it any whit advantage the Adversaries Cause, who will, have these Words,

Words, [*This is the true God*] referred unto Christ, that was mentioned immediately before. For Relatives are not always referred to the Antecedent immediately going before, but oftentimes to that which is chiefly spoken of; as appeareth from these places, *Acts* 7. 18, 19. chap. 10. 6. 2 *John* 6. 7. *Many Deceivers are entred into the World, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh. This is a Deceiver, and an Antichrist.* Wherefore the meaning of those words is thus: This, whereof I have last spoken, is the true God, (namely he that for (or [*sent*] it being, as I suppose the Printers Mistake) his Son Jesus Christ) and it is also eternal Life, (namely to know Thee, the true God, and to be in him by his Son Jesus Christ) with this accordeth, *John* 7. 3.

Answer. First, As to the Article in the Greek, it no ways hinders our Sense, or Exposition of the Words, but is rather a strengthening of it; for is it not more emphatical to say? *This is [the] true God,* than to leave out the Article, and read it, *This is true God, and Eternal Life.*

2. Those Words, *This is the true God,* are not to be referred unto Christ, because
Rela-

Relatives always are not referred to the Antecedent immediately going before, as *Acts* 10. 6. *chap.* 7. 18, 19. 2 *Joh.* 7.

To this I answer, 1st, That these words 2 *John* 7. *This is a Deceiver, and an Antichrist*, are no Relative either to Christ, or to the many Deceivers entred into the World, but as they are connexed to the description of the many Deceivers, and of the Antichrist. 2^{dly}. To those two Texts *Acts* 7. 18, 19. *chap.* 10. 6. It is one thing to say, that such a one, that knew not such a Person, did such a thing, and that lodgeth with such a Man, shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do, which points at the Person, and is a Description of him, and therefore referreth the Relative higher than the immediate Antecedent; and another thing to divide and refer the Relative; *This is the true God*, from the immediate Antecedent, *Jesus Christ*. 1. Because the matter of the Verse plainly relateth to the Son of God. 2^{dly}. The Relative, *This is the true God*, must of necessity be referred to *Jesus Christ*, because it is strongly fixed to the immediate Antecedent *Jesus Christ*, by the Words [*Him*] *that is true*, [*Him*] *that we are in*, as if it were said, *The Son of God*,
this

this *Him* that is true, this *Him* that we are in, (viz. *Jesus Christ*) *is the true God, and Eternal Life.* So that notwithstanding their Opposition to the Evidence of this Scripture, it is not weakened, but still remains a firm proof of the true Godhead of *Jesus Christ*.

Objection to Coloss. 2. 9. For in him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily. This word *Godhead* may denote the Divine Will, *Eph. 3. 19.* and forasmuch as the Apostle doth oppose that Speech, not to Persons, but to Philosophy and legal Ceremonies, it is evident, it is meant of the Doctrine of Christ, not of his Person. But should we take the words as they sound, yet could not such a divine Nature, as the Adversaries have imagined, be thence collected. For it is true and manifest that the fulness of the Deity or Godhead doth now dwell in Christ even bodily, in that his very Body is altogether Divine, as being made both of Divine and Spiritual Matter, namely that of the Heavens, see *1 Cor. 15. 45, 47, 48.* and being endowed with divine Life and divine Splendor, and divine Strength.

F

Answer.

Answer. First the words [*Godhead bodily*] cannot be limited, as only denoting the Divine Will of God ; because the Signification of the Word, will not allow of it. Godhead is the Nature of God, which is not only his Will, but his Power, Immensity, yea, all his essential Properties and Perfections.

Secondly ; Nor can we confine this Text to the parallel of *Ephes. 3. 19. And to know the Love of Christ which passeth Knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God,* viz. of his Love in all its parts ; because there wants the words [*Godhead bodily*] to be filled with all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, is to have all the fulness of the Nature and Perfection of God dwelling really, perfectly and solidly in him, or the whole Spiritual Substance of God.

Thirdly ; It is apparently clear, that the Person of Christ, and not his Doctrine, must be understood to have all the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in him : For it is said, *Coloss. 2. 8. Beware lest any Man spoil you through Philosophy and vain Deceit, after the Traditions of Men, after the Rudiments of the World, and not after Christ : For in him (viz. in Christ) dwel-*
leth

leth all the fulness of the Godhead (or Nature of God) *bodily*. They say indeed that by *Him* is meant the Doctrine, and not the Person of Christ, and that by *Godhead* is meant his Divine Will, and so that the fulness of his Divine Will, (*viz.* the revealed Will of God, otherwise it is incommunicable to the humane Nature) dwelleth in the Doctrine of Christ. But certain and plain it is that by *Him*, which betokens a Person, must be understood the Person it relateth to, *viz.* Christ; and the revealed Will of God is the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, which (their meaning is) must dwell in the Doctrine of Christ: but how absurd and foolish this is, let the Reader judg.

Fourthly; Those words are not simply opposed to Philosophy, but with some respect to the Persons in whom it dwelt, that we should *beware lest any Man spoil us through Philosophy and Vain Deceit — and not after Christ*, (*viz.* his Doctrine in opposition to their Doctrine, and his Person in opposition to their Persons, and his Fountain, (*viz.* the fulness of the Godhead) in opposition to their Fountain, *viz.* the Traditions of Men) and the Rudiments of the World: So

that these words, *In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, must of necessity be understood of the fulness of the Divine Nature of God in the Person of Jesus Christ through the Union of both his Natures.

Fifthly ; For them to say that this fulness of Godhead in Jesus Christ, is not of that supream Divine Nature of God, as we are treating of, but of an inferiour Divine Nature, floweth only from the Notions of their own Brains : for there is no such thing in *1 Cor. 15.* nor in any other part of the Holy Scripture : for though Christ as Man, and others by way of Gift, have had something of Divine Power and Splendor invested in them ; yet this is not properly another different Godhead, but a Demonstration of the same Supream Deity, through their Official Ministration ; and in all those 3 Scriptures, *Acts 17. 29. Rom. 1. 20. and Coloss. 2. 9.* wherein Godhead is mentioned, it must of necessity be understood of the Supream and Eternal Godhead only. So that I see not the least reason why the corrupt Notions of our Adversaries should weaken our Faith in this Doctrine, which is so clearly asserted,
in

in this as well as in many other Scriptures.

Objection to John 1. 1, 2, 3, 10. In the Beginning was the Word. Nothing is here concerning Christ's being from Eternity, since mention is here made of the beginning, whereas a Beginning is opposite to Eternity.

Ans. 1. If Christ were in the beginning of the Creation, and so as that all Things were made by him, *ver. 3.* then he did preexist the Creation, and it is not said he began to be in, or with the Beginning, but then he was, which denotes his being before the Beginning, and nothing could preexist the beginning of the Creation, but God alone.

Secondly ; They say, that the word [*Beginning*] is every where in the Scripture referred to the subject Matter, which is here the Gospel which *John* undertook to describe, as will appear if you compare this of *John* with *Mark* 1. 1. *Luke* 1. 2. *chap. 3. 23.* where, according to the Greek, it ought to be rendred thus, *And Jesus was about thirty years of Age, when he began, &c.*

Answer. First, *Mark*, in chap. 1. 1. declares unto us, what he knew only from the beginning of the preaching of the Gospel. 1st. Hinting to that of *John's* Ministration, and then immediately comes to Christ, ver. 9.

Second, *Luke's* beginning is said in ver. 3. to be from the very first, and he begins higher than *Mark* did, and gives us an account of the Conception and Birth of *John*, and then of Christ, and after these, that at Christ's Baptism, he began to be about thirty years of Age, or (as they will have the Greek) that he was thirty years of Age when he began, viz. to preach the Gospel, for so it must be understood ; so that (as they say) Beginning is to be referred to the subject Matter treated of : And therefore [*Beginning*] in *John* 1. 1. must not be limited to either of these, but referred to its own proper subject Matter, as the others were to theirs. Now that this subject Matter, to which it must be referred, is not the Gospel (as they affirm) doth appear, because he is speaking of the Creation of the World by the Word, which is confessed by them to be Jesus Christ. But here (as they think) they have a Salvo ;
for

for though all Things are said to be made by him in the Beginning, (yet they say it is not simply and absolutely All, but all Things belonging to the Gospel, like that in 2 Cor. 5. 17. *All Things are become new.*) And that the next words, *Without Him was not any Thing made that was made*, must be understood, that all Things were not [done] by him, for so the Greek will bear it, as they say : for though they acknowledg, they were begun by him, yet they were not brought to an issue by himself, but by his Apostles in his Name, and by his Authority, and so not done without Him. And they further object, that it is not said that the World was *created*, but *made* by him ; not that he made it, but it was made by him, as the second Cause, and that the word [World] doth not only denote the Heaven and Earth ; but besides other Significations, designeth either Mankind, as the present place sheweth, or the World to come, as appeareth by *Heb. 1. 6.* which they draw from *chap. 2. 5.* and by *chap. 10. 5.* which also they affirm to be spoken, not of this World, but of that which is to come, since it's said in *chap. 8. 4.* For if he were on Earth, he would

not so much as be a Priest. From all which they give us the sense of the words two ways. First, That Mankind was reformed, and as it were made again by Christ, because he brought Life and Immortality to Men who were lost, and subject to Eternal Death. 2d. The latter Sense is, That the World to come which we expect by Christ, is by him made as to us, as the same is said to become in respect of us, although it be already present to Christ and the Angels.

To these I shall give particular Answers.

First; All things that were made by Christ, cannot be here understood, of the *all things* of the Gospel, but of the Creation of the World. And this I shall endeavour to demonstrate, by shewing the great difference between the Text of *John*, and that of *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, and how little relation they have to each other.

In 2 Cor. 5. 17. *Therefore if any Man be in Christ, he is a new Creature: Old things are past away; behold, all things are become new.* The Words *all things become new*, must of necessity imply a Renovation; for tho the Graces of the Spirit are created in us, yet the Man is not created, but renewed, and restored by them.

So

So that in the same Sense that the Man is a new Creature, all things may be said to become new ; and this agrees with other Scriptures, as in *Ephes.* 2. 8, 9, 10. That which is said to be by [Creation] in Christ Jesus, is in *Titus* 3. 5. by the [Renewings] of the Holy Ghost, but in *John* 1. 3. it is said that *all Things were made by him* : which is not only a different mode of Speech to that of *Paul*, but does imply a different thing ; for, as I have shewed, the words of *Paul* import a Restauration or Renovation of the Creature, as they also do affirm, but this of *John* hath peculiar relation to the Creation of the World.

1st. Because the words, *All Things are made by him*, are plain and positive, and therefore it is dangerous and presumptuous to restrain their Sense to other Scriptures, whose subject Matter is foreign to it, and to impose such an uncouth Sense, which cannot naturally be drawn from it, and which is incoherent with other Scriptures, that mutually concur with its plain and proper Sense, as *Coloss.* 1. 16. to which place I may say something hereafter.

2dly. Those words, *All Things were made by him*, is meant of the Creation, and not of the Gospel, appears from ver. 10, 11. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not, &c.* Now to assert, as they do, That these words, *The World was made by him*, must be understood of Mankind that was reformed by Jesus Christ, is a squeezing forth such a Sense, as they cannot possibly bear, and it is unusual and improper in such a form of Words to express the Reformation of Mankind; and I do not know of any such absolute Text that asserts the new Creation, or Gospel-Renovation, but that there is some adjunct to explain it from the Creation of the World, as to be *created in Christ Jesus*; to become new, or the new Man which is created, and the like: and therefore such as force the Text, contrary to the genuine sense of it, to comply with a Gospel-Reformation, do greatly subvert the Word of God; nor is there any Agreement in those words to such an Exposition: for the World was so far from being reformed by Christ, that it knew him not, and his own received him not,

viz.

viz. his own Nation was not reformed by him.

3dly. I shall make some reply to their latter Sense of those words, *ver. 10. The World was made by him*, which say they, is, That the World to come, which we expect by Christ, is by him made as to us ; that is (if I mistake them not) it is made by a partial Reformation ; which if they would but speak out, is not made, but only making. And they say further, that this World to come, is already present to Christ and the Angels, that is (as I imagine to be their meaning) it is fully come to them, by their pre-knowledg and assurance of it, having laid its Foundation. What else they should intend by these and the like words, doth not at present occur to mind : But this is presumptuously asserted by them ; for there is no mention made of the World to come, neither is there any thing in the Text that relates to it ; neither is there any reason wherefore they should go about to prove, that because there is mention made of a World to come, in *Heb. 2. 5.* therefore this in *John 1. 10.* is of the World to come also. Nor do I yet perceive why *Heb. 1. 6.*

chap.

chap. 10. 5. and 8. 4. should be understood of the World to come, or what ground they have to impose from thence, their Sense on *John* 1. 10. For though the Apostle speaks of something which relates to the World to come in *Heb.* 1. yet he doth not begin with it until *ver.* 8. and therefore as the matter in *ver.* 6. plainly shews, the World there, is not the World to come, but the present World : But if it were, yet *John* 1. 10. must not be confined to this or any other Text any further than the concurrence of the Texts and Contexts, and the Signification of their words will bear. But now let us take notice how little difference the Socinians here make, between the time past, and the time to come. The World that was (with them) was the World to come ; that was made, was yet to make. What a monstrous way they have of expounding the Holy Scriptures ! by *all things*, say they, is only meant Gospel-things, and but some only of those Gospel-things were made by Christ, the rest were made by his Apostles, and that not in the beginning, as the Text asserts, but after even their own prefixt beginning. But if this may. pass for truth, at this rate
tis

'tis not to be found in the Holy Scriptures. But these Exceptions are groundless, and so are of no effect, to weaken the proof of the Deity of Jesus Christ from this Scripture.

Objection to Isa. 9. 6. Where Christ is called, *The everlasting Father, or, Father of Eternity*, as it is admitted by the Adversaries, who nevertheless say, it quite subverteth the Common Doctrine, by confounding the first and second Persons of the Trinity. He is the Everlasting Father, both because he is the Author of eternal Life to them that obey him, and liveth for ever to shelter, and protect, and cherish Christians who are elsewhere called his Seed, see *Isa. 5. 3, 10.*

Answer. First, The words in the Hebrew, אב—על *the Father of Eternity*, do not so much subvert the Common Doctrine of the Trinity, or confound the Persons, to understand them of the Divine Nature of our Lord Jesus Christ, than of him as only humane: For though Christ is said to be the Author of eternal Salvation, *Heb. 5. 9.* Yet it cannot be as Man only, either in the Mini-

Ministration of it, or being the prime Author. For there being a Ministration of Salvation under the Old Testament, Christ as Man could not be the prime Author of it; but God, who elected and fore-ordained Christ, and us in him, unto Salvation before the Foundation of the World, *Isa.* 42. 1. *Eph.* 1. 4. 1 *Pet.* 1. 20.

So then as Christ did not then exist in his humane Nature, as Man he could not be the prime Author, or Administrator of eternal Salvation: And when he was come, considered as Man, he could only bear a greater Testimony of the purpose and good-Will of God towards us, than any of the Prophets did before him. But to acknowledg the Son of God to be of the same Divine Nature co-essential with the Father, makes the name *Father of Eternity*, to have relation to him not personally, but as he is essentially God; and his being called by it, is an evident Demonstration of his Unity of Essence co-eternally with the Father, wherein only he can be the Author of eternal Salvation to us his Spiritual Seed.

Objection to John 17. 5. And now, O Father glorify thou me with thy own self, with

with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was. Christ doth beg this Glory of the Father which sheweth, that neither he was formerly in actual Possession thereof; for then he would have been in possession of it still; nor had a Divine Nature, for that would have supplied him with such Glory as he wanted: wherefore the Sense is, that Christ beseeches the Father to grant unto him that Glory which he had with him in his Decree before the World was; As we are said to be saved according to the Grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the World began.

Answer, First. The better to clear this Text from these Objections, I shall expound it. 1st. If it should be understood, that these words denote a Depriation of Glory, yet it must not be absolutely considered; for the Divine Nature of Christ, ever was, is, and shall be in it self, infinitely Glorious without the least Diminution, Alteration or Change. But we are to take it with respect to the great Humility and Condescension of his infinite glorious Nature, in uniting himself with our Nature. It is said, *Phil. 2. 6, 7, 8. Who being in the Form of God, thought it*

not Robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation: — He humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death. The Divine Nature of Christ consented to the exposing of his humane Nature, that was in so great a Conjunction with it, to Sufferings as an ordinary Man. And if God is said *to humble himself to behold the things that are in Heaven, and in the Earth*, Psal. 113. 5, 6. Then surely this must be a far greater piece of Condescension, for the Son of God to disrobe himself as it were of that Power and Majesty which he had with the Father, in subjecting his humane Nature to suffer the Revilings and Scourgings of wicked Men, and to be put to Death by them. Now if the Text must be understood of a Deprivation of Christ's former Glory: then the meaning of Christ's Prayer is, that as his Condescension in taking our Nature, had been an Eclipse of his Divine Glory, Power and Greatness, in laying it aside, as it were to suffer in his humane Nature for our sakes, that now the Father would so translate his humane Nature from that mean Estate and Condition, to one more glorious, that might better suite with his infinite Perfection,
and

and correspond with it. But,

Secondly ; This Text most properly (as it seems to me) ought to be understood not of a Deprivation of Glory of the Divine Nature, but only of the Exaltation of the humane Nature of Christ ; as if Christ should have said, And now, O Father, glorify thou me in my humane Nature ; or glorify my humane Nature, in taking of it into that Glory which my Divine Nature had with thee before the World was.

This I humbly conceive is meant by the words of our blessed Lord ; but take it in either sense, it agrees with the Deity of Jesus Christ.

Secondly ; I come more particularly to answer the said Objections.

1st, Though (as it is objected) it may be concluded from the Words, that because Christ begs this Glory of the Father, therefore he had it not in actual Possession before. Yet this is only respecting his humane Nature, which opposes not the Truth of his Deity ; for though he was not yet supplied by it, or glorified, *John* 7. 39. Yet he then had the Divine Nature, and was in Union with it.

2^{dly} ; For

2dly ; For any to say, that that Glory which Christ had before the World was, is only meant of God's Decree, is an imposing on the Text that which it cannot bear, for it doth not run parallel with 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. because it is one thing to say, that we are saved and called according to his own Purpose and Grace, which was given us in Christ before the World began ; and another thing to have Glory before the World began : the one plainly shews that we were not actually called nor saved before the World was, but were then in the purpose of God only ; and the other is positively spoken of the Glory that Christ had in actual Possession, as the sense of the words import. And I hope these are sufficient Answers to clear the Text of these Objections.

Objection to Coloss. 1. 16. For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers, all things were created by him and for him.

First, They say, that this Scripture speaketh of Christ as a second or middle cause, that God created all things by Jesus Christ, *Eph.* 3. 9.

Answer.

Answer. First, I do acknowledg that Jesus Christ is two ways to be considered.

1st, Essentially, as he is God, and so all things are of him and from him, and created by him, indifferently with other Divine Persons.

2^{dly}, Personally, as he is the second Person in the Godhead, and so is he also in the Works of Creation; for all things are of the Father by the Son, through the Spirit, 1 Cor. 8. 6. John 1. 3. Gen. 1. 2. Psal. 104. 30. Eph. 2. 18. For as the Father is of himself a Divine Subsistent, so he worketh from himself; and as the Son is of the Father, so he worketh from the Father; and as the Holy Spirit is of the Father and the Son, so he worketh from them both, yet neither of them exist or work before each other in time, but do naturally and necessarily work together: for when we say the Son is the second Person in the Deity, we grant the Father to be the first, (neither in time nor Excellency of Nature, to the other Divine Persons) but in respect to Preheminence, according to his peculiar manner of Subsistence and incommunicable Property. So also the Divine Persons have their Order

der, or Preheminence of working according to their Order or Preheminence of Subsistence and incommunicable Property in the Divine Essence.

Secondly ; They say that *all things in the Heavens, and on the Earth*, are not used for all things simply, and absolutely, appeareth, because the Apostle saith, *By him God hath reconciled all things in Heaven and on Earth* ; and also in the words themselves, it is not said the Heavens and the Earth were created by Christ, but *all things that are in the Heavens and on the Earth*. And the Sum of what they understand by the Text, is, that after God had raised Christ from the dead, and had given Glory to him : all the things both in the Heavens and on the Earth were by him reformed and reduced to another State and Condition, in that he became the head of Angels and Men, who before acknowledged God only for their Lord.

Secondly, To this I answer.

1st, That if we can reconcile the word [*Create*] in *ver. 16.* so as that naturally its Signification doth import but one and the same thing with the word [*Reconcile*] in *ver. 20.* then indeed there is some reason

son to acquiesce with them in their sense : But as the words have different Significations, so they signify to us different things.

2dly, Though *reconciling all things to God by Jesus Christ, whether in Heaven or in Earth*, must be understood in a limited sense ; yet there is not the same, nor so good reason, for all things that were created by Jesus Christ to be so considered : For those *all things* that were reconciled, were all things that were reconcileable by the Blood of the Cross, whether in Heaven or in Earth, and not all things absolutely in Heaven and in Earth ; for the evil Angels are not reconcilable : but in *ver. 16.* the case is much different, and is to be understood simply and absolutely, that by Jesus Christ all things were created : for the words are positive, *By him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth* ; and because we should not misapprehend the Apostle's meaning, he explains himself more fully to us, that they were *all things both visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers* : And surely this cannot be meant of a Reformation or Renovation of all things

things in Heaven and Earth, because the good Angels never wanted such Reformation; neither were all *Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers*, either of evil Angels, that are invisible, or of wicked Men on Earth, then renewed, or so reduced by Reformation, as that Christ became their Head, and was so acknowledged by them: For though Christ became the Head of his own Church, yet the World did not know him in such a manner as to own him for their Sovereign Lord, and to yield true and sincere Obedience to his Laws, for under the Conduct of Satan, the Dragon Heathen Empire made head against Christ, and all that professed his Holy Name. And tho something may be said, that in the Reign of *Constantine* the Great there was a mighty Reformation made in the Empire of the World, yet this cannot answer the Import of the words, *For by him were all things* [already created] they were not to make in future times, but they were already done before. So that I see not the least grounds wherefore they should impose such an unnatural sense upon the words, but that they must of necessity be understood of the Creation of all
all

all things in Heaven and Earth by Jesus Christ. And though they make this Exception, that it is not said the Heavens and the Earth were created by him, but only the things contained in them; yet this omission cannot be an Exclusion of them, nor hinder what is asserted in the Text, but that it remains a sufficient proof of the Deity of Jesus Christ.

Objection to Heb. 1. 10. This Author (to the *Hebrews*) doth not refer the Creation of Heaven and Earth unto Christ, but only the abolishing of them.

Answer. First, I do affirm that the Creation of Heaven and Earth, must of necessity be applied to Jesus Christ; because the word [*and*] in the beginning of the Verse is a conjunctive word, that joins this Verse to the Words going before, which relate to the Son of God, so that as in *ver. 8.* we read, *But unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever;* So also by virtue of the Conjunction with *ver. 10.* it is proper to understand the Text, as if the Apostle should instead of the word [*and*] have said, *But unto the Son he said, Thou, Lord, in the Beginning*

ning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. And this Conjunction is put for the same purpose ; for in *Psal.* 102. 25. from whence this Text is taken, there is none of it.

Secondly ; There can be no reason assigned, wherefore the abolishing of the Heavens should only be referred to Christ, when it is not by virtue of a Conjunction immediately annexed, but of one annexed to the Creation of them which doth preceed, and therefore that of the Creation is primarily ~~to be~~ referred to the Son of God.

Objection to those Scriptures wherein the Deity of Christ is proved from that Divine Worship and Adoration which is given to him. Forasmuch as all the places that testify concerning Christ's divine Honour, do also testify that this Divine Honour was given to him at a certain Time, and for a certain Cause ; it is plain, that the Divine Nature of Christ cannot thence be collected. And whereas it is said, *Isa.* 42. 8. *I will not give my Glory to another*, it is meant, as is presently added, *nor my Praise to graven Images*, God speaketh of them who have no Communion

munion with him, and to whom, if any Glory and Honour be ascribed, it redounded not to him. But he saith not, that he will not communicate his Glory with such a one as Christ, which is dependent of him, and subordinate to him, for by this means no Diminution of his Glory is made, since the whole is referred to him.

Answer, First ; Though some places that testify concerning Christ's Honour, do also testify that this Honour was given to him as at the time of his Exaltation ; and because he had a Name given him above every name, *Phil.* 2. 9, 10. Yet the Divine Nature of Christ may be collected from his Divine Honour and Worship given to him. For the time and cause of the Exaltation, and Honour of Christ's humane Nature by Donation, doth not hinder the truth of his Divine Essence, from the Divine Honour ascribed to him ; because such Honour and Worship is not, nor cannot be simply conferred on Christ as Man, but by virtue of his Divine Person : and this appears from what is already proved, that God only is to be worshipped with Divine Worship, even Him only who is God by Nature.

Secondly, To *Isa.* 42. 8. they say, That God's not giving his Glory to another, is an exclusion of Graven Images, but they will not allow it as a total Exclusion of all others.

Answer. It's true that Graven Images are excluded, and so also are all others whatsoever that are created Beings; for the words themselves import, that besides Graven Images, he will not give his Glory to another, *viz.* Nature nor Person: So that even the Son himself, if he had not an uncreated Existence, subsisting in the Nature of God, he would be excluded from Divine Glory, and therefore the Divine Glory ascribed to him, proves him to be a Divine Person.

As to the rest of those Scriptures that I have cited, to prove the Deity of Jesus Christ, by the Divine Honour and Adoration given to him, I have not met with any that have assailed them, and therefore I hope that no material Objection can be made against them.

C H A P. II.

Wherein is answered some Objections that are inferred by our Adversaries, from divers Texts of Scripture against the Deity of Jesus Christ.

Objection from *Mark* 13. 32. *But of that Day and that Hour knoweth no Man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* From this Scripture some do conclude, that Christ is not God, because he knew not all things.

Answer. The Humanity of Christ might not know all things, until they were revealed by his Divine Person, as it did not know of that Day nor Hour; for the Divine Person had not yet revealed it; and though the Humanity of Christ, which is not the Divine Person of the Son, but is only a part of Christ's Person, is here called the Son; yet this impedes not the Text of this Exposition, for the Humanity of Christ is sometimes put for his Divine Nature, *John* 13. 13.

Objection from Acts 2. 36. Therefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. From whence is formed this Syllogism.

He that was made Lord by another ; he, if he be a God, was also made a God by another.

But Jesus, of whom it is certain that he is a God, was made Lord by God.

Therefore he was also made a God by him.

Answer. This Syllogism may be confessed, as it is reconcileable to the Human Nature of Christ : for as he was Man, he had a Name given him above every Name, and a Lordship or Kingdom, and Authority to execute Judgment, and was called *Lord*, *Phil. 2. 8, 9. Isa. 53. 12. Joh. 17. 27, 29.* And so also as he did officially minister the Power of God, and was one to whom the Word of the Lord came, he may be called *God*, *Joh. 10. 35, 36. Heb. 1. 1.* and in this Sense he may be said to be made a God by the Father : but as this is not the proper or supream Godhead and Lordship of Christ, because it is not natural nor essential, so doth it not oppose his
natural,

natural, essential, and supream Godhead, and Lordship, as he was God from all Eternity.

Objection from Colossians 1. 15. where Christ is said to be *the First-born of every Creature*. The First-born must always be contained in the number of them, of whom, except the Parents, it is said to be the First-born; and consequently Christ must be comprehended in the Number of Creatures, whose First-born he is said to be.

Answer. Christ's being the First-born of every Creature, neither includes him to be only a Fellow-Creature with others, or excludes him from the Deity.

First; Because Christ cannot properly be said to be the First-born of every Creature, by Creation; for then it could not be said, That *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*, unless a Creature could preexist its own Creation, and give it self a Being. *John 1. 3.*

Secondly; Christ's being call'd the First-born of every Creature, cannot be understood of the natural Birth of some kind of Creatures; not of Man, for there was none created before *Adam*, and *Eve* was

the Mother of all Mankind, and *Cain* was her first-born, not Christ ; neither could he be the first-born of Angels, for they do not propagate their kind, *Mark* 12. 25. *1 Cor.* 15. 15.

Thirdly ; Christ cannot be the first-born of every Creature in time, preceeding all others in the new Creation by Regeneration, unless he had existed in his humane Nature, before the Patriarchs and Prophets of old, and all the holy Men from the Foundation of the World.

But having spoken in the Negative, I shall now endeavour to demonstrate how Christ may be called the first-born of every Creature.

1st. Christ may be said to be the first-born of every Creature from the Dead, in like manner as he is called the first begotten of the Dead, and became the first Fruits of them that sleep, *1 Cor.* 15. 20. *Rev.* 1. 5.

2^{dly}. Christ may also be called the first-born of every Creature, as preexisting every Creature in his Divine Nature ; like as the same Apostle expounds it in the following words, *ver.* 16, 17. *For by him were all things created,--and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.*

As

As if he should say, the very reason wherefore I call him the first-born of every Creature, is (not because of Creation or natural Birth, or spiritual by Regeneration) but because he was before all things in respect of time, and Creator of them. So that it is clearly manifest there is no ground from this Text for any to believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is either excluded from the true Godhead, or included as a meer Creature amongst others, by his being called the first-born of every Creature.

Objection from *Rev.* 3. 14. where Christ is called the beginning of the Creation.

Answer. This must not be understood as if Jesus Christ were the first of God's Creatures, but that he was the first that gave being or beginning to the Creatures: *Rev.* 22. 13. *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.* Beginning here is the first by whom all things had their beginning, and not the first of Creatures that had its beginning.

C H A P. III.

Containeth Answers to divers of the Socinian Arguments against the Deity of Jesus Christ.

O*bjection.* If the Divine Nature of Christ were God, one with the Father and the Spirit; then the Father and the Spirit would be incarnate.

Answer. The Union of the Divine Persons being in Nature and Essence, and not in Person, or personal Properties; one Person in the same Nature, may be said more properly to be incarnate than another.

Objection. If Christ have two Natures, then not only that Person that did before exist is the Son of God, but the holy Issue of the Virgin also, so that that opinion would make two Sons of God, and consequently two Persons in one Christ.

Answer. Although the Divine Nature of Christ which preexisted his Incarnation, be the Son of God; yet the Issue of the Virgin coming out of the Loins of
David,

David, and receiving its matter from Man, cannot be naturally the Son of God, but the Son of Man: so that as Christ with respect to his Divine Nature, is the natural Son of God; so likewise though he was not generated after the common way of Mankind, yet being deduced out of the same matter, so far he is naturally the Son of Man. But from hence I see no reason to conclude that there are two Sons of God, or that Christ is two Persons: for though the matter of Christ's Humanity would have made a distinct Person, if it had been generated after the common way; yet it was never so, because it never had its Being but in Union with the Divine Nature, when the Person of the Son was united to it, and so together became the second *Adam*, who *was made a quickening Spirit* in the one Person of Christ, *1 Cor. 15. 45.* So that the Humanity of Christ was but a part of his Person, and no distinct Person of it self; for Christ took on him the form of a Servant only, and not the Person, *Phil. 2. 7.* The Scriptures declare no such thing as two Persons, but that he took our Nature, which became a Person in the Divine Subsistence of the Son: so that the Person of Christ

was not a Compound of two distinct Persons together, but the one Person of the eternal Son of God, as it were clothed with Humanity; for the whole Person of Christ, (*viz.* the Word and Flesh) is represented to us, as but one only begotten Son of God, *John* 1. 14, 18.

Objection. Had Christ had a Divine Nature in being the eternal Son of God, he needed not the Assistance of the Holy Spirit, to furnish him with a humane Nature from a Virgin, being himself able to produce it of her, unless you will say that his own Divine Nature was in the meanwhile idle.

Answer. *Eftwick* on *Biddle* in page 208, 209. answers this Objection: he saith, "The Holy Ghost had no Efficiency or Casualty in the Incarnation of our blessed Saviour, which was not common to the Trinity; for as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are inseparable, touching the Divine Essence and Power of working, so likewise are they inseparable in their Operations.

" 'Tis a common Comparison to illustrate this Truth: Three Virgins do jointly make up a Garment for one of them

“ them only to wear : so all the three
 “ Persons as one Cause, did produce the
 “ humane Nature ; yet was it taken on-
 “ ly into the Person of the Son of God.
 “ Christ became Man, not in regard of
 “ the Divine Nature simply, which is
 “ common to Father, Son, and Holy
 “ Ghost, but as it subsists in the Son of
 “ God : 'Tis true, if
 “ we respect the || O-
 “ riginal of working, there is a difference,
 “ the Father as he is
 “ of himself, and from
 “ no other ; so doth
 “ he work from him-
 “ self, not from the
 “ Son ; and the Son as he is from the Fa-
 “ ther, so doth he also work from the Fa-
 “ ther : but because there is no Distinction
 “ of the Persons, in regard of the
 “ formal essential Principle of working,
 “ it follows, there is no Distinction or
 “ Separation of the Divine Persons in
 “ the work it self. It was therefore both
 “ an absurd and blasphemous Inference,
 “ and that as you say, from our Princi-
 “ ple, either that it was needless for the
 “ Holy Ghost to frame the Body of our
 “ Lord

*|| The word Original must
 here be understood ac-
 cording to the Author's
 sense of the personal Pre-
 heminance of the Father,
 according to his personal
 Subsistence in the Divine
 Nature, and not in re-
 spect to Original of time.*

132 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

“ Lord, or else that the Divine Nature
“ of the Son of God was idle. Will you
“ grant then (which by this your Reason
“ must needs follow) because Christ was
“ conceived by the Holy Ghost, there-
“ fore God the Father was idle, and not
“ the prime Worker of this marvellous
“ Conception.

What is here cited out of this learned Man, sufficiently shews the Weakness of this Objection against the Deity of Jesus Christ.

C H A P. IV.

Wherein is answered some Objections against the Scriptures that prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

Objection to *Matth. 28. 19. Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* It cannot be rightly inferred, that because the Holy Spirit is here ranked with the Father and the Son, therefore he is equal to them; by this account when the Apostle *1 Tim. 5. 21. saith, I charge thee (Gr. I obtest) before God and the Lord Jesus*

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 133

Ius Christ, and the elect Angels, that thou observe these things without Prejudice, doing nothing by Partiality; joyning the elect Angels with the Father and the Son: this would imply that the elect Angels are equal with the Father and the Son.

Answer. There is not the same reason to imply from this of *Timothy*, that the elect Angels are equal to the Father and the Son, as there is for the Holy Spirit's Equality with them, from *Matth. 28*. For if we rightly consider these two Scriptures, we may easily see that they are not Parallels; but that the Holy Spirit, and the elect Angels, are joined together with the Father and the Son, upon far different accounts; the one are ranked together, not as Equals with the Father and the Son, but because they are ministring Spirits that have their Eyes on the Church of God, and behold the Order and Discipline of it, whose Work and Office is to attend upon it, and be familiar about it, *1 Cor. 11. 10. Psal. 34. 7*. Inſomuch that we ought to be very careful of ſpeaking or doing any unſeemly thing that might hinder the Miniſtration of thoſe bleſſed and Holy Spirits. Now for this cauſe *Paul* exhorteth *Timothy* to obſerve thoſe things

things, as in the Presence of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Angels ; and therefore they are ranked together, and not as Equals in Nature and Divine Worship ; for they refuse to assume that Glory which is peculiarly proper to God alone, *Rev.* 22. So that this Text relates to the Inspection of Angels, into the Obedience of the Saints, in the way of which Protection is ministred to them by the Angels, who are said to encamp round about those that fear the Lord, *Psal.* 34. 7. Or else the Apostle shews, by ranking these three together, that the Angels are Witnesses to this Charge, though in all things else they cannot be, unless they could search the Heart, and try the Reins. And why may not the Apostle take them in as Witnesses, as *Moses* did, who called Heaven and Earth, *viz.* God, Angels, and Men, joining them as Witnesses against *Israel*, that he had set before them *Life and Death* ? &c. *Deut.* 30. 19. But the Holy Spirit, *Matth.* 28. is not ranked together with the Father and the Son, only as a ministring Spirit, or as one that beareth Witness together with them in any matter, but to be equally honoured with them
both :

both : for in this Ordinance of Baptism, wherein we worship God, in acknowledging what he hath done for us in order to Salvation, we are commanded to ascribe it to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. And there is reason for it : For though the Father had accepted the Merits of his Son, on conditions of true Faith and Repentance ; yet if the Holy Spirit had not undertaken to work these Conditions in us, we had been lost ; so that we are obliged, both from the Work it self, and the Command of God, to attribute the same Honour to the one as to the other : and herein chiefly lies the Difference of this Text from that of *Timothy*, because this commands Divine Worship to be given to the Holy Ghost, together with the Father and the Son, which declares his Divine Nature.

Objection to *Isa.* 6. 9, 10. compared with *Acts* 28. 25, 26, 27. To these two Scriptures I have met with *Biddle's* Objections, stated and answered ready to my Hand by Mr. *Estwick* in his Confutation of *Biddle's* Confession of Faith, Page 307. whose Words I shall prefer rather than my own.


Biddle ;

136 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

Biddle; “ In the one place *the Lord said*,
 “ in the other *the Holy Ghost*; therefore
 “ the Adversaries do conclude, the Ho-
 “ ly Spirit is the Lord. This arguing is
 “ very frivolous: for at this rate I may
 “ conclude that *Moses* is the Lord; com-
 “ pare *Exod. 32. 11.* Israelites are called
 “ God’s People, *ver. 7.* God calls them
 “ the People of *Moses*: and *Isa. 65. 1.*
 “ *I am found of them that sought me not*,
 “ *Rom. 10. 20.* *Isaiah* is more bold, and
 “ saith, *I was found of them that asked not*
 “ *after me*; therefore *Isaiah* is the Lord.
 “ God is said by his Power to save us,
 “ *2 Tim. 1. 8, 9.* *Paul* attributes the
 “ same to himself, *1 Cor. 9. 22.* and to
 “ *Timothy*, *1 Tim. 4. 16.* therefore *Paul*,
 “ yea *Timothy*, is God. If the Adversar-
 “ ies say these things are otherwise a-
 “ scribed unto the Lord, than to the
 “ Men aforesaid: I answer, it is more
 “ than the Texts themselves hold forth,
 “ which neither express nor intimate any
 “ such thing. If they say, that if not
 “ in these, yet other Texts, and the Na-
 “ ture of the thing it self doth sufficient-
 “ ly teach it: I reply, that I can make
 “ the same Answer, touching the Lord
 “ and his Holy Spirit; but it is well that
 “ there

“ there is such an Intimation in the Texts
“ themselves; for in the one the Lord
“ spake to *Isaiab* in a Vision; in the
“ other, That the Holy Ghost spake
“ them by *Isaiab* to the Fathers. These
“ two are different, since *Isaiab* only
“ heard these Words in the Vision; for
“ had the Fathers been there, why should
“ God bid *Isaiab* go, and tell them to the
“ People; *Paul* ascribes these Words to
“ the Holy Ghost, to intimate only, that
“ whatsoever was spoken in the Scrip-
“ ture, was recorded by the Inspiration
“ of the Holy Spirit, and so spoken by
“ him.

Answer. “ Your Elusions to avoid the
“ strength of the Argument are vain,
“ and your Examples taken out of the
“ Scriptures, are *fallacia parium*, are un-
“ like to this in hand. Sometimes an In-
“ strument speaks in the Name of the
“ great God that sent him. This is
“ your Evasion, therefore it must be so
“ taken; *Isa. 6.* compared with *Acts 28.*
“ this is a plain Fallacy. *Exod. 32.* *Mo-*
“ *ses* calleth the Israelites *God's People* in
“ *Covenant with him*; and God calls them
“ *the People of Moses*, being under the Curse
“ of the Law, by reason of their Idola-

“ try :


138 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

“ try ; and because he was God’s Instru-
 “ ment to bring them out of *Egypt*, and
 “ to conduct them in the Wilderuess ;
 “ it is apparent to every one, and the
 “ Text holds it forth, that they were
 “ otherwise God’s People, and other-
 “ wise the People of *Moses*, he being a
 “ finite, distinct and separate Substance
 “ from the Lord God Almighty. We
 “ grant, that because these are different,
 “ therefore it would be absurd to infer,
 “ that *Moses* is the Lord : where is the
 “ Holy Ghost called God’s Servant, or
 “ God’s Instrument ?

“ The second place, *Isa. 65. 1.* with
 “ *Rom. 10. 20.* in the one place it is said,
 “ *I am found of those that sought me not ;*
 “ so saith God, in another place, *Isaiah*
 “ *saith the same Words*, therefore *Isaiah*
 “ is the Lord. It is clear, the Lord by
 “ *Isaiah* foretold the Conversion of the
 “ *Gentiles*, and that he by his Grace mo-
 “ ved them to seek him, before they
 “ looked for Salvation by Christ. *St. Paul*
 “ relating the same Text, sheweth that
 “ *Isaiah* freely spake of the calling of the
 “ *Gentiles*. Who is so blind, as not to
 “ see clearly, that *Isaiah* used those
 “ Words, as God’s Messenger in the
 “ Name

“ Name of the Lord? and what is more
“ usual with the Prophets than to use
“ such Words, to gain due respect to
“ their Words? *Thus saith the Lord.*
“ This Example then is not parallel to
“ that under Debate; it is not agreeable
“ to the Scripture-Language for the Holy
“ Ghost to speak in the Name of the
“ Lord.

“ The third, touching God's saving,
“ and *Paul's* saving, is as unfit, and as
“ far from the Mark, as the former; for
“ evident it is, that *Paul* himself could
“ not plant, except God gave the Bless-
“ ing, and he always ascribes Salvation
“ to God, as the principal cause thereof,
“ and confesseth that he is but God's In-
“ strument, by whose Ministry he saved
“ much People. A Creature cannot be
“ properly called God, nor doth any
“ other Scripture, or the nature of the
“ thing it self teach any such thing;
“ nor doth the New Testament, unless
“ by quoting Texts out of the old; Sha-
“ dows being gone, use such Expressions,
“ lest we should conceive Gods subordi-
“ nate to the High God: This you grant,
“ but you add withal, *That you can make*
“ *the same answer, touching the Lord and*
“ the

140 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

“ *the Holy Ghost.* You have the Face not
 “ to blush at strange Answers : What is
 “ it that you cannot write? But if you
 “ should be peremptory in such an An-
 “ swer, you cannot make it good. What
 “ Line in God’s Words, yea, what proba-
 “ bility can you produce for this Parallel.
 “ It is great Reason that if a Man will
 “ forsake the Common Road, that he
 “ should give a good account of his going
 “ into By-Ways, not trodden by Passen-
 “ gers many hundred years together : . It
 “ is well, that by your own Confession,
 “ the other alledged-Scriptures, do clear-
 “ ly distinguish betwixt the principal
 “ Cause and Instrument; and it will be
 “ requisite, if you look to be credited,
 “ that you demonstrate by the Circum-
 “ stances of the Text, *Isa. 6.* or by some
 “ other convincing Proof, that the Holy
 “ Spirit is a created Angel; and that he
 “ is in a proper Notion God’s Ambassa-
 “ dor, and his Instrument to inspire the
 “ Holy Prophets, to discharge their Em-
 “ bassy, which is a Task, I know, impos-
 “ sible to be performed by you.

“ *There is (say you) an intimation in the*
 “ *Texts themselves; for Isaiah only heard*
 “ *the words in a Vision, and was to tell them*

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 141

“ to the People not present with him : But
“ Paul ascribes them to the Holy Ghost, be-
“ cause whatsoever was spoken in the Scrip-
“ tures, is recorded by the inspiration of the
“ Holy Ghost, and so spoken by him. This is
“ then his meaning : These Words were
“ from the Lord as first delivered by him
“ to *Isaiah* ; and from the Holy Ghost, as
“ they were penn'd in the Scripture.
“ This is a senseless and groundless Fig-
“ ment, as though the Holy Ghost spoke
“ not as well to *Isaiah*, in that Vision to
“ deliver his Message to the People, as to
“ inspire him to write infallibly what he
“ had heard in that Divine Vision. Is
“ there any intimation of difference in
“ these to be distinguished Actions ? and
“ as tho the Lord himself did not both ?
“ The Current of the Scripture is to this
“ purpose, without a shadow of Contra-
“ diction. Take that one place, 2 *Pet.* 1.
“ 20, 21. *No Prophecy of Scripture is of any*
“ *private Interpretation.* Prophets pro-
“ phesied not to their Auditors their own
“ Sense, but God's Mind : *For Prophecy*
“ *came not at any time by the Will of Man :*
“ *but holy Men of God spake as they were*
“ *moved by the Holy Ghost.* So that they
“ were acted by the Spirit, not only in
“ wri-

“ writing, but in speaking ; yea, those
 “ Prophets which were not God’s Pen-
 “ men, as *Elias* and *Elisha*, yet were in-
 “ spired by the Holy Ghost : Such vain
 “ Fancies as yours are, Mr. *Biddle*, can
 “ please none but vain and unsettled
 “ Heads.

To this I add, that the Lord’s speaking
 to *Isaiah* in the Vision *chap. 6.* and the
 Holy Ghost speaking by him to the Fa-
 thers, *Acts 28.* cannot be understood, that
 at two different times the Lord and the
 Holy Ghost spake to the Prophet. 1. Be-
 cause the Holy Ghost did not only inspire
 the Prophet afterwards to record in wri-
 ting his Message to the Fathers, but by
 Word sent the Prophet, saying, *Go unto*
this People, and say, &c. So that the
 Prophet was to say to the Fathers, what
 the Holy Ghost had said by word to him
 in the Vision. 2dly. Because *John* tells us,
Joh. 12. 41. that *Isaiah* said these things
 when he saw his Glory, and spake of him ;
 whereby it is manifest, that the Prophet
 spake these things unto the Fathers from
 the Mouth of the Lord, and the Holy
 Ghost in the Vision. And forasmuch as
 the Apostle tells us, that it was the Holy
 Ghost which spake in that Vision, it shews,
 that

that he is the same Lord and *Jehovah* that the *Seraphims* worshipped.

Objection to 1 Cor. 3. 16. Know ye not that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? It is objected by some from this place, that the Holy Spirit is God, in that our Body is said to be his Temple. I answer, That it would follow, could it be proved, that our Body is so the Temple of the Holy Spirit, as to be his by the highest Interest, and primarily dedicated to his Honour — they are his by Inhabitation. The Spirit is disposed of, and given by God to us, and consequently he is ours by Interest, not we his: And accordingly the Apostle concludeth from thence, that we ought with our Body to glorify not the Spirit, but God, who is openly distinguished from the Spirit, and declared to be the Proprietor of our Body.

Answer. First, They say indeed that our Body is not the Temple of the Holy Ghost by Interest, but they cannot prove it, for our being his by Inhabitation, excludes not our being his by Interest, any more than God's dwelling in the Temple which *Solomon* built, did exclude his highest

est Interest to it, and its chief Dedication to his Glory ; but our being his first by Interest, makes us his by Inhabitation.

Secondly ; Though the Holy Spirit be given of God, and so by donation becometh ours ; yet neither doth this exclude us from being his by the highest Right ; for the Holy Spirit's being sent, and given to us, sheweth his Office and not his Essence, of which I shall speak hereafter : and if his being sent doth not disprove his Divine Essence, it cannot disprove us from being his by the highest Right, which is in effect the same.

Thirdly ; Nor doth it thence follow, that because the Apostle saith, we must glorify God in our Body, that therefore he (not the Spirit) is the Proprietor of our Bodies. For if the Holy Ghost had a lesser Right to our Body, as a Creature only helping with us to worship God, our Body could not be properly said to be his Temple ; for no Temple beareth the Name of the Worshippers (which then with us the Spirit would be) but of him that dwelleth therein, and is worshipped : and therefore seeing that our Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghost,
and

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 145

and it consequently follows, that he is to be glorified therein, it then agrees with the Apostle's words, *Glorify God in your Body.* And to say that the Holy Ghost inhabits the Temple of God, *1 Cor. 2. 16.* and receives the same Worship, either defiles, and dishonours his Temple, and gives his Glory to another, or acknowledgeth the Holy Spirit to be God : And therefore as we must not presume to think that the Holy Apostle should so dishonour the Temple of God, and pollute his Holy Name, as to ascribe the name of a Creature to it ; So we may conclude, that our Body which is the Temple of God (as appears in *1 Cor. 3. 16.*) would not be asserted to be the Temple of the Holy Ghost, unless by his highest Interest as he is God. And though our Adversaries would have the words [*Glorify God in your Body*] to inforce the Sense of the Text, in favour of their opinion ; yet they have a far different Signification, than to bring in God as Proprietor of our Body, in opposition to the Holy Ghost's highest Interest to us : For the Apostle does not intend by these words either to exclude the Holy Spirit from the highest Interest

H

to

to our Bodies, or to intimate to us, that God and the Holy Ghost are two different Essences, but he rather designs, by the word *God* indefinitely spoken (instead of the Holy Spirit before mentioned) to include also the Father and the Son ; that not only the Holy Ghost, but all three Divine Persons should be glorified in our Body, and in our Spirit, which are God's. Now let us sum up the whole, and see what our Adversaries gain by these Objections. First, I have shewed that our being his by Inhabitation, excludes not our being his by Interest. Nor, Secondly, does the Donation of the Holy Ghost, or his being sent, exclude our being his by the highest Right. Nor yet, Thirdly, do these words *Glorify God in your Body*, destroy the primacy of the Holy Spirit, to our Bodies : And if neither of these disprove that our Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghost by the highest Right, and as primarily dedicated to his Glory ; then nothing yet they have said, can disprove his Deity from this Scripture : for, as it is confessed, that to prove the one is to prove the other ; so not to disprove the one, is not to disprove the other.

Objection

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 147

Objection to 2 Cor. 3. 17. Now the Lord is that Spirit : and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty. By [that Spirit] is not here meant the third Person in the Holy Trinity ; but the Expression implieth the same Spirit that was before in the 6th Verse, opposed to the Letter, and consequently the Mystery or hidden Sense of the Law, denoted by the Letter ; for thus the word Spirit is to be taken, Rom. 2. 29. Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the Spirit, and not in the Letter. And Rom. 7. 6. But now we are delivered from the Law, that being dead wherein we were held ; that we should serve in newness of Spirit, and not in the oldness of the Letter. And Rev. 11. 8. where Jerusalem is mystically and spiritually called Sodom and Egypt. Wherefore the Sense of the Words of Paul is this, namely, That the Lord Christ is the Mystery, Life, Scope and Kernel of the Law ; as being both foretold therein, and prefigured by the Ceremonies thereof.

Answer, First ; As they say Spirit is not put for his Person, in ver. 6, 8. but for his Effects and Operations, or Gospel-Ministration ; however it cannot from

148 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

thence follow, that *Spirit* in *ver. 3, 17, 18.* is put only for his Effects, and not his Person.

1st. Because the Effects of the Spirit, (*viz.* his Writing, and Gospel-Liberty) is joined together with the Spirit ; and therefore the Spirit here is not put for his Effects, but for Himself ; and so it is in *ver. 18.* where it's said, *We are changed into the same Image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.* [Margent, *Of the Lord the Spirit.*] Here also the effect of the Spirit, to wit, our change into the same Image of Christ's Glory, being joined together with the Spirit (there is a necessity that by Spirit must be meant his Person, and not Effect.) And this is noted to us by the Translators of our Bible, in writing [*Spirit*] with a great Letter, when for his Person, and with a little Letter, when the Spirit is put for his Effects, which may be seen in this Chapter, where thrice *ver. 3, 17, 18.* the Person of the Spirit is understood, and thrice his Effects, *ver. 6, 8.*

2^{dly}. That the Lord Christ, is the Mystery, Life, Scope, and Kernel of the Law, as being both foretold therein, and prefigured by the Ceremonies thereof,
may

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 149

may be granted to them, but not that this is properly intended by those Words, [*The Lord is that Spirit*] as pointing thereby only to his Effects in *ver.* 6, 8. 1st Because we may better refer those Words to that Spirit, which is put for his Person in *ver.* 3. which, as it there appears, is the efficient cause of the Epistle of Christ written both in the Hearts of the Apostles, and of the Church of *Corinth*, *ver.* 2, 3. So that [*that Spirit*] is there first put for his Person, and the efficient cause of the Effects, for which it is put in *ver.* 6, 8. and afterwards in *ver.* 17, 18. being joined with his effects, and thereby differenc'd as the efficient cause and Person of the Spirit, is said to be the Lord, or, as it is exprest, the Lord is that Spirit: and therefore if they will have these words [*that Spirit*] *ver.* 17. to point at Spirit before mentioned in the Chapter, it must then be referred to *Verse* 3^d, Person to Person, and not Person to effect. 2^{dly}, Nothing is more plain than that Spirit in *ver.* 17. must be taken for his Person, because his Effects are so strongly joined to him, *viz.* Liberty, which the Gospel it self, (*viz.* the Letter of it) does not give, but by the Power

and Efficacy of the Holy Spirit. So that it's clear from the Text, that by these words, [the Lord is that Spirit] must be understood the Person of the Spirit in the Unity of Essence with the second Person, the Son of God. 3dly, In Verse 18. We are said *with open face to behold as in a Glass, (viz. of the Gospel) the Glory of the Lord, by whom we are changed into the same Image from Glory to Glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord, [or the Lord the Spirit.]* Which whither it be meant of our being more and more renewed in the Spirits of our Minds in this World, or, as I rather take it, from the Glory of the Lord, which we behold in the Glass of the Gospel, to our eternal Glory; yet it is by the Lord the Spirit, the efficient Cause of this change, and therefore it is not the Effect, or Grace of the Spirit only, but his Person.

4ly. The Dutch Translators read *ver. 17. The Lord is [the Spirit] and not [that Spirit]* and so it does not point to Spirit before-named, but is to be understood as the Words lie in themselves; and thus it cuts off the Relation, and is not governed by what is meant by Spirit going before. So that I see no reason

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 151

son wherefore these Objections should weaken the Proof of the Deity of the Holy Spirit from this Scripture.

Objection to 1 John 5. 7. For there are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. The Sum of what is objected against this Scripture, being laid down, and learnedly as well as largely confuted by Mr. *Francis Chinell* in his Book of the Divine Trinunity, I shall make a Recital of his Words so far as it is needful to our purpose, from page 251, to Page 256. "It is objected by some, that the words, *These three are one*, 1 John 5. 7, are not to be found in some ancient Copies, and therefore it will not be safe to build a Point of such Weight and Consequence upon such a weak Foundation.

"*Answer.* It is true that these Words are not to be* found in the Syriac Edition, but they who speak most modestly, do acknowledg that the Syriac Edition is not authentick.

* *Si Syrum ceterosque sequimur, vel hiatus admittitur, vel ἀνολογία quæ imprimis elegans turbatur. Mihi qui talem primo usurparunt in sacris licentiam deoquæ-
res videntur. Heinsius, in locum.*

H 4

Learned

152 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

“ Learned *Heinsius* is much offended with
“ that Edition, as appears by his Anno-
“ tations upon 1 *John* 5. 7. And if we
“ consult the Scriptures, and compare
“ this Text with the following Verses,
“ and with some other places of Scrip-
“ ture, which are more plain, and then
“ add the Testimony and Interpretati-
“ ons of the ancient and reverend Do-
“ ctors of the Church, concerning the
“ Words in question; we shall be able to
“ pass a right Judgment upon the point in
“ hand.

“ *First*, The Equality of the number
“ of Witnesses, *sutes* very right, *three* Wit-
“ nesses on Earth, and *three* in Heaven.

“ *Secondly*, The opposition between the
“ Quality of the Witnesses *on Earth*, and
“ Witnesses *in Heaven*; and yet their
“ sweet *Harmony* and Agreement in one
“ Testimony; *all six bear Witness to one*
“ *and the same Truth.*

“ *Thirdly*, The *Diversity* of the very
“ Nature of those three who bear Wit-
“ ness on Earth, and the Unity of their
“ Divine Nature, who bear Witness in
“ Heaven, is very considerable, and it is
“ excellently expressed in the Variation
“ of the Phrase; *These three are one*, ver.

“ 7. and

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 153

“ 7. and these three agree in one ; name-
 “ ly, in one Testimony, ver. 8. *Though*
 “ *their Nature be different, yet their Testi-*
 “ *mony is the same.* But it is objected,
 “ that the *Complutensian* Bible saith of
 “ the Heavenly Witnesses, that *these three*
 “ *agree in one*, ver. 7. I humbly offer this
 “ Satisfaction to pious and learned Men ;
 “ That we have good reason to believe,
 “ that there is an imprudent Addition in
 “ the *Complutensian* Bible, rather than an
 “ Omission of so many ancient and ap-
 “ proved Bibles ; and therefore it is fit
 “ that that Addition should be expunged
 “ out of that one Copy, by the concur-
 “ rent Testimony of so many Copies.
 “ Moreover, it is clear by the joint Testi-
 “ mony of other Copies, that the words
 “ *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* are omitted in ver. 7. and the
 “ words *ἐκ τῶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, belong to ver. 8,
 “ and therefore there is an inexcusable
 “ Omission, and an
 “ imprudent Trans-
 “ position in that cor-
 “ rupt † Edition.
 “ But then it is fur-
 “ ther objected, that
 “ these Words, *These*
 “ *three are one*, are

† *Merces satis fallaces*
vendit officina Chr.
Plantini Antverpiæ in
editione 1584. excusa
& cum Bib. Ar. Mont.
Vulgar. Joh. 8. 17,
18.

154 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

“ wanting in some other Greek Copies.

“ For Answer I proceed in my Observations.

“ *Fourthly*, If we look upon the Scripture-Account in other places, we shall find it exactly agreeable to the Account in this place, 1 *John* 5. 7.

“ In *John* 8. our Saviour pleads that two *Witnesses in Law* were sufficient for the Proof of any Point, *John* 8. 17. and in ver. 10. saith he, *I am one, and my Father that sent me is another*; they are two *Witnesses*, and yet but one God, *I and my Father are one*, *John* 10. 30. One in Power, and therefore one in Nature: He speaks not of the Spirit, because Christ was not yet glorified; nor was the Spirit yet manifested by that eminent and glorious Mission and Effusion, which was to follow after the Ascension of our blessed Lord. But he did foretel that the third Witness was to be sent from the Father by the Son, *John* 15. 26. But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me. I might add to these Testimonies all other places of Scripture,

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 155

“ ture, wherein all the three Witnesses
“ are named together, and then produce
“ all the places which have been former-
“ ly cited in this Book, to prove the co-
“ essential Trinunity of those Heavenly
“ Witnesses.

“ *Fifthly*, The Copulative [*and*] in
“ the beginning of the verse, 1 *John* 5.
“ 8. doth very fitly connect the whole
“ seventh Verse with the eight, as they are
“ printed in our ordinary Translation.

“ *Sixthly*, *Hierom* doth assure us that
“ the Words in question were expunged by the
“ Arians, because the few Words do hold
“ forth an undeniable Proof of the Divine
“ and Coessential Trinunity of those Hea-
“ venly Witnesses. And divers other learn-
“ ed and judicious Men conceive that
“ these Words were blotted out in the
“ time of *Constantius* and *Valens* the Em-
“ perors, who were sworn Enemies of
“ the blessed Trinity,
“ and professed Pa-
“ trons of Arianism.

“ *Seventhly*, The
“ Hereticks did blot
“ out those Words,
“ || *John* 4. 24. God is
“ a Spirit, as *Ambrose*

|| *Vide Ambros. lib.*
3. *de spiritu sancto.*
cap. 11. *jurati verita-*
tis hostes lucem hanc non
tulerunt ideoque erase-
runt. Vide Heinsum
in 1 Joh. 5. 7.

assures

156 *A Defence to Scriptures that*

“ assures us; and therefore this Practice
 “ of repugning such Words in the Scrip-
 “ ture as did refute their Errors, was
 “ too common amongst the Hereticks of
 “ old, as we might prove by Witnesses
 enough, if that were our Business.

“ *Eighthly*, These Words, 1 John 5. 7.
 “ are to be found in Copies of great An-
 “ tiquity and best Credit.

“ * *Ninthly*, This
 “ Text is cited by the
 * Athanas. *Tom.* 1. “ ancient Fathers, by
 Pag. 91, 92, 93. “ *Athanasius* in his
 “ Dispute with *Arius* at the Council of
 “ *Nice*, and *Arius* never denied it for to
 “ be Scripture, which certainly he would
 “ have done, if there had been any
 “ doubt made of it in the primitive
 “ times. It is cited by *Cyprian* in his
 “ Book *de Unitate Ecclesie*. *Paxillus* in
 “ his Book *de Monomachia*, proves by an
 “ Induction of the learned Doctors of
 “ the Church, both before and since *A-*
 “ *thanasius*, that the Doctrine of the co-
 “ essential Trinunity of these Heavenly
 “ Witnesses, was generally received by
 “ all that were esteemed orthodox and
 “ pious in the Church of Christ. *Calo-*
 “ *vinus* also in his *Fides patrum ante Concili-*

prove the Holy Spirit's Deity. 257

“ *um Nicenum*, gives in a Catalogue for
“ the Satisfaction of all that desire Reso-
“ lution in this weighty point. [See Mr.
“ Estwick of the Godhead of the Holy
“ Ghost. Dr. Alting his Vindication of
“ this Text in his Confutation of the Ro-
“ covian Catechism.]

C H A P. V.

*Wherein are answered some Objections infer-
red by our Adversaries from divers Texts of
Scripture, to disprove the Deity of the Ho-
ly Ghost.*

Objection from *Matth. II. 27.* *All
things are delivered unto me of my Fa-
ther, and no Man knoweth the Son but the Fa-
ther; neither knoweth any Man the Father
save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son
will reveal him.* How could this be true,
were the Holy Spirit a Divine Person
distinct from the Father and the Son, and
in all things equal unto both? for some
other besides the Father would have
known the Son, and some other besides
the Son would have known the Father,
namely the Holy Spirit.

Answer.

158 *Objections from Texts*

Answer. First, We must not understand this Text in the strictest sense, as if Christ the Son of God was not known at that time by any besides the Father.

1. He was known as Man, *John* 7. 27. *We know this Man whence he is.*

2. He was known as the Son of God, *John* 1. 41, 49. Said *Andrew* to *Simon Peter*, *We have found the Messiah.*—*Nathaniel answered and said unto him, Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.* His Disciples believed on him, *chap.* 2. 11. and others, *chap.* 4. 53.

Secondly, Neither is this Scripture to be considered, as though Christ's Disciples and others then had not some Knowledge of God the Father ; for in *John* 6. 44, 45. it is said, *No Man can come to me, except the Father draw him.*—*Every Man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* So that no Man could come to Christ without some Knowledge and Teachings of God the Father.

Thirdly, It then follows that if this Text is not to be understood totally to exclude all Men from some Knowledge of the Father and the Son, until afterwards they should be revealed ; then it intends only
to

to exclude them from some special and peculiar Knowledg which they have, and in reference to their revealing of each other.

The Father knoweth the Son, and the Son the Father, in a different manner from all Creatures, in that they know each other perfectly of their own Self-Knowledg: Yet the Words of Christ are not to be taken simply of that peculiar Knowledg, but with reference to the Revelation which the Father makes of the Son, and Christ of the Father, as appears in *ver. 25.* where Christ saith, *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast hid these things from the Wise and Prudent, and hast revealed them unto Babes.* And now it follows that Christ tells us, *No Man knoweth the Son [but] the Father; neither knoweth any Man the Father [save] the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him:* As if he had said, *No Man knoweth the Son, so as to reveal him savingly [but] the Father, neither doth any Man (after the same manner) know the Father [save] the Son only.* And this suits with the following Invitation for burthened Souls to come to Christ, as to one that can reveal and open the Father's Heart,

Heart, wherein they may (through him) have rest for their weary Souls. *ver. 28, &c. chap. 1. 18. ch. 6. 41.*

Fourthly ; Having opened the Text, and shewed that it must not be positively understood, I shall now answer directly to what is objected concerning the Holy Spirit. And,

First, I shall note, that if Men who are named, (and only intended) are but in part excluded, then the Holy Ghost, who is not named (neither intended) cannot from these words be excluded from the knowledg of the Father and the Son.

Secondly, We must not conceive that the Holy Spirit is excluded from the Fellowship of this Knowledg which the Father and the Son have of each other, because he is not mentioned ; for the Ministration of the Spirit was not yet come. I said before that here we are not to understand* Knowledg simply, but with reference to Revelation ; and this was now ministred by the Father and the Son more secretly through the Spirit, but apparently (to assure his Disciples, and convince the Sons of Men that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, that was sent forth from
the

the Bosom of the Father, to declare his Will) by such sensible, visible and external Testimonies, as would leave all Men without excuse : The Father bearing witness to the Son, twice by a Voice from Heaven, and the Son by the mighty Works he wrought in the Father's Name, bore witness of him, and gave undeniable proof of his special Mission from God, and that he was the Messiah that was to come. *John* 1. 18. *chap.* 5. 17, 36, 43. *chap.* 14. 10. 2 *Pet.* 1. 17, 18. *Matth.* 3. 17. And this was the very reason that so little mention was made of the Holy Ghost, the Mystery of God being left more fully to be opened and revealed after Christ's Ascension, by that Divine Person, whose proper Work it was to confirm the Testimony of the Father and the Son, that went before. So that the Holy Ghost was not omitted by Christ, because he was not in the Unity of that Knowledg ; but because the time for the great work of his ministerial Revelation was not yet come. So that no Foundation can be laid on this Scripture in opposition to the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

Obje-

Objection from 1 Cor. 2. 12. Now we have received not the Spirit of the World, but the Spirit which is of God. The Spirit which is of God is God's Effect, and depends upon him, and so is inferiour to him.

Answer. 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11, 12. But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit — For what Man knoweth the things of a Man save the Spirit of a Man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

First, The Apostle useth this Comparison not to demonstrate the Being of God, but to shew that we cannot know the things of God till the Spirit of God reveals them to us.

Secondly, They cannot from thence conclude that the Spirit of God is God's Effect, and so is inferiour to him, any more than that the Spirit of Man is also the Effect of Man, and so inferiour to Man: But if they will run the Comparison to demonstrate the Being of God, we must then conclude, that as the Spirit or
Soul

Soul of Man (being the most excellent part of his Nature) is essential to his Being ; so by this Rule is the Spirit of God also, which proves his Deity.

Objection from John 1. 32. And John bare Record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven like a Dove, and it abode upon him. The Spirit is not God, because he changed place, and descended in a bodily Shape.

Answer. First, This Descension of the Holy Ghost disproveth not his Deity, because the like hath been said of God, in *Gen. 11. 5. And the Lord came down to see the City and the Tower.* And in *Gen. 18. 21. I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it. And the Lord descended on Mount Sinai, Exod. 34. 5.*

Secondly, Although the most High God hath no shape, yet he appeared to *Abraham* in the Shape of a Man, representing his Assumption of that Nature, *Gen. 18. 2, 22. chap. 19. 1.* and therefore this Objection against the Deity of the Holy Ghost is of no weight ; and not only from the aforesaid Example, but also because we find, that when the Holy Ghost

164 *Objections from Texts*

Ghost fell on the Disciples, that there were cloven Tongues, which was an outward and visible sign of the Gifts and Operation of the Holy Spirit, and did neither betoken his corporal Substance, nor was a description of his Shape. In like manner the Holy Spirit's descending in the bodily shape of a Dove, did neither betoken his corporal Substance nor change of place; but like *Noah's Dove*, Peace and Glad-tidings towards Men. For *Peter* in his first Epistle, chap. 3. 20, 21. makes the Waters of *Noah* a Type of Gospel-Baptism; and then, as after *Noah's Ark* did rest upon dry Ground, a Dove was the minister of glad-tidings to him and all his House: so God was pleased in answer to that Type (and as was fittest to represent the Innocency of Christ) after his Baptism and Salvation from the Water, to send the Holy Ghost to him in the same shape: and afterwards to his Disciples, to minister such divine Power and Comfort as might strengthen, comfort, and encourage them to that work which God had appointed for them: so that there is not the least reason from this Scripture to deny the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

Objection

Objection from John 16. 13. Howbeit, when He the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will shew you things to come. Ver. 14. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. Ver. 15. All things that the Father hath, are mine: therefore, said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you. The Holy Spirit is here said not to speak of himself, but what he hears, which sheweth that he receiveth those things by Commission from another, and therefore he is not God, for God cannot be said to receive any thing from another which he had not before.

Answer, First, The Holy Spirit must be two ways considered.

1. Essentially, as he is essentially God.
2. Personally, as he is a Divine Person in the Godhead.

First, As he is essentially God, he can neither receive Commission, or be under the direction of any other of what he should either do or speak.

2dly. As he is a Divine Person or Subsistent in the Godhead, and proceedeth from

from the Father and the Son, and hath his peculiar Office, he may be said to receive, to speak, and be sent by Commission from another ; he may be inferiour in Office (though not in Nature) to the other Divine Persons. And hence it is, that some times the Holy Ghost is said to be sent in another's Name, and given to us, *John* 14. 26. and at other times it is spoken, as of his Power in himself to work according to his Will, *John* 16. 7, 8. *1 Cor.* 12. 11. Now each of these are proper to the Holy Ghost, *viz.* to be given, sent, to receive, and speak from another, or to have Power in himself to work as he will. The first they respect his Office, according to his Personal Subsistence by procession from the Father and the Son, (and not that he had not the Knowledg of those things before ;) and the other takes in the Divine Essence too.

Secondly, It may be further said, That the Disciples of our Lord, had much darkness on them, and were ignorant of many things contained in the Holy Scriptures, till Christ did enlighten their Understandings ; and therefore they might not have fully understood, and digested
this

this sacred Truth ; for we read of some which said, *We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost,* Luke 24. 45. *Acts* 1. 6. *Acts* 19. 2. This being premised, our Lord Jesus might speak this to assure them of the Holy Ghost's infallible Conduct into all Truth, not only because he is the Spirit of Truth himself, which cannot err ; but also because he should not speak only as a single voluntary Act of his own, but with the mutual concurrence of the Father and the Son : So that whatsoever he should hear actually interceded for by Christ, and assented to by God the Father, which should be needful for us to know, that the Holy Spirit should shew unto us. So that this Scripture wherein the Holy Ghost is said not to speak of himself, but what he hears, &c. hath a peculiar relation unto his Ministerial Office, which cannot be repugnant to his Divine Nature ; for one Person may be inferiour to another in Office, and yet of the same Nature, as hath been said.

Objection from *Rev.* 1. 1, 13. *ch.* 2. 7. where it appears that the Spirit which the seven Churches of *Asia*, were required

quired to hearken unto, was none other but the Angel that was sent to *John*, and did personate Jesus Christ ; and therefore the Holy Spirit cannot be God equal with the Father.

Answer. The Angel that personated Jesus Christ, the same bid the Apostle *John* to write to the seven Churches of *Asia* : But in all the Epistles, he did not speak to him in his own Name or first Person, nor dictate the Epistles as from himself, but from the Person of Jesus Christ, saying unto *John*, *Write these things*, saith he, (*viz.* the Son of God) — *the First and the Last, which was Dead and is Alive, &c.* So that when the Angel in the conclusive part of the Epistles saith to *John*, *He that bath an Ear, let him hear what the [Spirit] saith to the Churches* ; he speaks not of, and from himself, but of Jesus Christ who is that Spirit whom they are bid to hear. And this agrees with 2 *Cor.* 3. 17. *The Lord is that Spirit* ; and is farther confirmed and laid as a Foundation-Truth, in the Beginning of this Vision, *viz.* that what the Angel said must be referred to the Almighty Lord, *ver.* 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and*

and which is to come, the Almighty. And therefore this Scripture is so far from proving this erroneous opinion, touching the Holy Spirit, that it confirms his Deity; for if Jesus Christ be of the Divine Essence, and the Holy Spirit is said to speak or say when Christ saith, then it is evident that Christ and the Spirit are Co-essential.

C H A P. VI.

Wherein are answered three Texts of Scripture, from which our Adversaries urge, that the Father only is God, in opposition to the Doctrine of the Holy Trinunity.

Objection from 1 Cor. 8. 6. *But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* Say they, It could no way come to pass that Paul being about to explain who that one God is, should mention the Father only, omitting the other Persons, if that one God were not the Father only, but also the Son and Holy Spirit, since those two Persons, besides
I the

170 *Objections that the Father*

the Father, were as necessary to declare who that one God is, as the Father himself.

Answer. It might come to pass, that *Paul* should call God Father, omitting the Names of the other Divine Persons, and yet not exclude them from the Unity of the Godhead.

First; He might call God Father, not simply respecting the Person of the Father, but indefinitely as he is Creator, *viz.* Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in opposition to false Gods, *ver.* 5, 6. *For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth (as there be Gods many, and Lords many:) But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things—* which is agreeable to *Mal.* 2. 10. *Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?*

Secondly; It doth not from hence follow, that because the Son and the Holy Spirit are here omitted, and the Father only is called that one God; that therefore the Father only is God: because that such omission, is no denial nor exclusion. For the Father being in the Unity of Essence with the other Divine Persons, must not be simply considered, when he is called

led by those Names, as are common to all three Subsistencies and the Deity, neither must the Son nor the Holy Spirit, unless the matter treated of confine us to the Person, which in the Text is reconcileable to the Divine Essence; for all things are of God indefinitely, Father, Son and Holy Ghost: and therefore the Father may be called that one God essentially, comprehending the other Divine Persons.

Thirdly; There is some reason that may be given, wherefore the Father is, called God, and the Son and Holy Spirit are sometimes omitted, and left to be included in that common Name, and that is because of the preeminence that the Father hath among the Divine Persons: For though in excellency of Nature, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are neither of them above each other, nor any one of these blessed Persons before the other in Time, yet the Father hath a preeminence of Order and Subsistence according to his manner of self-subsisting in the Divine Essence. For the Father is named first, and then the Son and the Holy Spirit, 1 *Joh. 5.7. Mat. 28. 10.* and that because the Father is of none, the Son is of the Father, and the Holy Ghost is of them both. And from
I 2 hence

172 *Objections that the Father*

hence it is, that we worship the Father by the Son, and through the Spirit, *Rom. 1. 8. Eph. 2. 18, 21. Phil. 3. 3.* So then it is proper enough to call the Father that [*one God*] (essentially considered, as he is in the Unity of Essence with the other Divine Persons) forasmuch as he hath this pre-eminence of Order and Subsistence, and that the other two divine Subsistences are of and in the Father.

Secondly, they say, That if Christ and the Holy Spirit were God, it were as necessary to name these two Persons as the Father to declare who that one God is.

To this I answer, That if these Words *One God the Father*, are personally to be considered of the Father, yet there was no necessity to mention the Son and the Holy Ghost: For I hinted before, that when the Father is called that *One God*, the Son and the Holy Spirit must be included in that common Name, as being of and in the Father, who is essentially so called. Now the Apostle having told us who that one God is, by naming that Person, which most properly and significantly includes the rest, it is sufficient, seeing that his design was more to tell us in opposition to those many false Gods, That to us there
is

is but one God, than to give a large Description of him. So then let the words *One God the Father*, be taken in either sense as Creator, and so common to all three Subsistencies, in the Unity of the Godhead, or personally of the Father ; yet they do neither exclude Jesus Christ, nor the Holy Spirit from the Godhead.

Thirdly, some do further add, that Christ is manifestly distinguished from that one God, and so is demonstrated not to be that one God.

Answer. It was necessary that Christ should be distinguished from that one God the Father, by those Words, *One Lord Jesus Christ*, to betoken his Lordship by Donation, as he is Man or Mediator, because it is different to his supream and essential Lordship ; and therefore it requires a different Name to express it by : But yet this does not exclude him from the Unity of Essence with the Father : But, as in *ver. 5.* it is said, *There were many Gods, and many Lords inferiour to those Gods* ; So this is to shew, in opposition to them, that there is but one God to us Christians, and but one Lord and Mediator, *viz.* Jesus Christ, that considered as Man was exalted to that Dignity,

174 *Objections that the Father*

nity, and. appointed by God to be our Lord.

Objection from Eph. 4. 6. One God and Father of all, who is above all; lest we should understand the Trinity by the Name of that God who is called one; two Persons of the Trinity were already mentioned, and distinguished from that one God.

Answer. There cannot more be proved from this Scripture, than what is granted, to wit, that the Father hath some Preheminence (though not in Nature nor Time) to the Son and Holy Spirit.

First, In that he hath his Subsistence, neither by being generated, nor by Procession, but is of himself a Divine Subsistent in the Divine Nature.

Secondly, The Father may be said to be above all, and have the Preheminence with respect to the Work and Office of the other Divine Persons, in bringing of us to God the Father, as the ultimate Object of our Faith and Worship, but yet not so as to exclude the Son and Holy Spirit: For though we through the help of the Holy Spirit and Intercession of Christ, come to the Father who is above all their ministe-

ministerial Offices, and through them in us all, *viz.* the Saints; yet the Father, Son, and Spirit, either or all of them, essentially considered, may have equally the same Worship and Adoration given to them, but respecting the different Share, Work and Office, belonging to our Salvation, proper to each Divine Person, we ought in Divine Worship to make different Attributions accordingly thereunto.

Thirdly, The Apostle's Design was not to make a full Description of God unto us, but to shew the calling of the Church, that it was but one body in the Unity of one Spirit, in one Hope and Faith, in one Lord, unto one God and Father, who is above all the ministerial Offices of Christ and the Holy Spirit, who work from him, and through them he is in us all. And therefore it was needful to use those different Titles, otherwise the Union of the Church in one Spirit, with one Lord the Mediator, and head in our Nature, and Order of Faith and Worship, could not so distinctly be understood.

Objection from John 17. 3. And this is Life eternal, that they might know thee the

176 *Objections that the Father*

only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Since Christ so described the Father, as to call him the [*only*] *true God*, it is understood that only the Father of Christ is the most high God; to exclude them from the true Godhead, who were then falsely esteemed and worshipped for Gods: and not only them, but all others also besides the Father, from the most high Godhead; for the word [*only*] excludeth all others from the Communion of the Predicate, *viz.* the [*true God*] besides him, *viz.* the Father, to whom it is applied, and consequently Christ and the Holy Spirit: For if the Gods of the Heathen are by those words of Christ understood to be excluded from the true Godhead, because it is apparent, that they are different from the Father; then it is necessary that all who are apparently different from the Father of Jesus Christ, should be excluded from that true Godhead; for otherwise the Argument which should from these Words be drawn to exclude the Idols of the Heathen from the true Godhead, would be invalid.

Answer. 1st. Christ so describeth the Father, as the only true God, to exclude them

them from the true Godhead, who are falsely so esteemed and worshipped for Gods, and that are not God by Nature: But it is not to be understood as if the Person of the Father only were the true God; for though they say that the Adjective [*only*] as often as it is implied to exclude other Subjects from the Communion of the Predicate, belongs to the Subject, not the Predicate, yet this must be only granted where the Subject is not in the Unity of the same Essence with other Subjects, but here it is; and therefore the word [*only*] belongs to the Predicate, not the Subject. Now then the Question will be, whether the word [*only*] is here so used as to exclude others that are in the Unity of Essence with the Subject, from the Predicate or not. If it had been said, that the Father only is the true God, it had excluded all others from the Unity of Essence with him, and consequently Christ and the Holy Spirit. But the words are, *That they might know thee, the only true God*; and thus the word [*only*] doth not exclude such from the Communion of the Predicate, *viz. the true God*, that are in the Community of the Subject, *viz. the Father*, as Christ

178 *Objections that the Father*

and the Holy Spirit are, but those only that are out of Community with him. So that they must first prove, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are not in the Unity of Essence, coessential with the Father, before this Argument can be of use to them.

2dly. I shall note wherefore Christ did assert his Father's Deity more than his own, and that was to inform us what was Life eternal. For as the Knowledg of the Father as true God, yea, as the only true God, is essential to Salvation: so also is the Knowledg of the Son of God, as Mediator in both Natures: for to know and believe in the Son, as the only true God only, will not save us; but we must know him also as he is in our Nature, in which he purchased eternal Life, *Rom. 3. 25. 1 John 4. 3. John 6. 53.*

Now seeing that it was necessary to assert the Father to be *the only true God*, and to mention the Son, that we should know him as Mediator in both Natures, as his Name Jesus Christ sutes unto, why then should any imagine that this Text of Scripture opposes the Deity of Jesus Christ?

To what is before objected concerning the Holy Spirit, I shall add what another
of

of our Adversaries faith on this Text, viz. That our Saviour Christ setting down those Persons, in the Knowledg of whom eternal Life consisteth, makes no mention of the Holy Spirit; whereas if he were God, the Knowledg of him would be as necessary for the Attainment of eternal Life, as that of the Father.

To this I answer.

First, That here to omit the mentioning of the Holy Spirit, does not deny the Knowledg of him as God to be essential to Salvation.

For, as was said, to know Jesus Christ in both Natures, is essential to Salvation: for we find that eternal Life is entailed on the Son of God, *John* 3. 18. viz. his Person in our Nature, and not in his human Nature alone, (for that is but an Appendent to his Person) and then the Holy Ghost being only omitted by Name, he must be included in the Knowledg of the Father and the Son, as being the Spirit of the Father and the Son, and personally proceeding from them both, and subsisting coessentially in them: And therefore when the Father and the Son are mentioned, the Holy Spirit must be included.

Secondly,

180 *Objections that the Father*

Secondly, All saving Knowledg or Revelation of God, depends upon God himself, who only can so reveal himself unto his Creatures, *Matth. 11. 25, 27. I thank thee, O Father, because thou hast hid these things from the Wise and Prudent, and hast revealed them unto Babes. — No Man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any Man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. And John 16. 15. All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore said I, He (viz. the Spirit) shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you. And 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit. — For what Man knoweth the things of a Man, save the Spirit of Man which is in him, even so the things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God.* From which Scriptures we find that the Revelation of the Knowledg of God is appropriated to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and that none [*but*] the Father [*save*] the Son, and [*but*] the Holy Spirit can savingly reveal God, or each other personally and essentially unto us. And as we cannot exclude our Knowledg of the Father, and the Son from the Revelation of the Spirit, though it is appropriated

ated to the Father and the Son by those words [*but the Father*] and [*save the Son*] nor exclude our Knowledg of the Spirit from his self-Revelation to us, seeing all Revelation is by the Spirit; then surely there is no reason to exclude our Knowledg of the Holy Spirit, as essential to Salvation, and consequently his Deity, though he is not named with the Father and the Son. Besides, if this should be allowed to disprove the Deity of the Holy Spirit, by the same Rule the Deity of the Father would be disproved, when eternal Life is appropriated to the Knowledg of the Son only, which is more the current of the New Testament, 1 *John* 5. 11, 12, 20. *John* 3. 36. And therefore as all saving-Revelation both of the Father and the Son, is by the Holy Spirit, who proceedeth from them, and is coessential with them both, and as we cannot be ignorant of him who is so necessarily included in our Knowledg of the other two Divine Persons; so it was not so necessary that he should be named as it was for the Father and the Son, seeing he is included with them, as the Revealer of them both, *John* 16. 15. 1 *Cor.* 2. 10, 11, &c. So that from *John* 17. 3. there

there is no reason to exclude either Jesus Christ or the Holy Spirit from the Unity of the Supream Godhead.

There are other Objections urged against this Doctrine, by our Adversaries, which may seem to be very plausible to those that have not weighed them in the Ballance of the Sanctuary. Say they, how can three be one, and one be three? This is so absurd and contrary to their Reason, as if one should say, that three Men are one Man, and one Man is three: And how can the Son be begotten of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceed from both, and yet both of them co-essential, and co-eternal with the Father.

To these and divers others of the like nature, I shall give a general Answer. May we not say, that these Men do favour of a *Nicodemus* Spirit; and therefore the Words of Christ to him may be alluded to them, *John* 3. 9, 10. *Nicodemus said, how can these things be? Jesus answered, If I have told you Earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of Heavenly things?* For those would far more have exceeded his carnal Reason. And if we know not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the Bones do
grow

grow in the Womb of her that is with Child, even so we know not the Works of God, who maketh all, *Eccles. 1. 5.* and if our Faith be limited to carnal Reason, we cannot believe the Resurrection of the Body; and if the Works of God are too high for us, and his Ways are past finding out, *Rom. 11. 33.* how much more impossible is it for finite Creatures to conceive the perfect manner of Existence, and mysterious Subsistence of an infinite Being. We cannot by searching find out God, nor the Almighty unto Perfection, *Job 11. 7.* God hath been graciously pleased to make known himself unto us in such a manner as that we may rightly worship him, and as is sufficient for our Support and Comfort in all our Afflictions here below, and perseverance to Salvation: And there we must rest; for as for those secret things which belong to God, we are not capable to comprehend them, *Deut. 29. 29.* And therefore we do imbrace this mysterious Doctrine, because it is revealed to us in the written Word of God: But they reject it as inconsistent with natural Reason, forcing the Scriptures to comply with that, whereby they make it the Rule of Faith

184 *A General Answer, &c.*

Faith rather than to admit of that as a Mystery which God hath declared to be a Mystery, 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 6. — *Col.* 2. 2.

Moreover, we cannot conceive, that it could consist with the faithful discharge of that great Trust which God had committed to his own Son, and Christ to his Holy Apostles: If while they were asserting so many things, that might give us to understand the supream Deity of the Son and Holy Spirit, that they did not intend nor believe the same themselves; nor can it be imagined, that if they had taught the contrary Doctrine to the Deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, that they should deliver it in such words, as that the Common use and sense of them should oppose and destroy their true meaning intended by those Words.

But to conclude my Discourse on this Subject, four Things are necessary to be considered in order to a right Judgment in this point of Doctrine.

First, Consider how firm a Foundation this Doctrine hath in the Holy Scriptures, what Number of sacred Texts there are, that plainly assert the Deity of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

2dly,

2dly. Consider what monstrous work the *Socinians* make, to escape the force of those clear Scripture-Testimonies, that assert the Deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit; how absurd they are in their Expositions, and the violence they use to defend their Heresy, by wresting, denying and abusing the Holy Scriptures, may easily be perceived; and what pains they take to squeez out of some few Texts, that which is not contained in them, and is repugnant to the current of sacred Scripture.

3dly. Consider how fairly those very Scriptures on which they build, are reconciled to this Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and how our Expositions of them are coherent with it, and in themselves, as is apparently manifest from what hath been said in answer to them. So that their Doctrine is inconsistent with the Infallibility of the Word of God: for while they are not able to reconcile so great numbers of sacred Texts (that assert the Deity of Christ and the Holy Ghost) to their Opinion, they render it exceeding ambiguous, and full of Discords. And therefore there is a necessity that we acknowledg the Holy Trinity,

nity, otherwise in effect we reject the Scriptures, as insufficient to guide us into Truth and Righteousness ; and therefore seeing the Authority, and the sweet Harmony of the Holy Scriptures depends on the truth of this Doctrine, and that the contrary Opinion destroys both, and leaves us destitute of a Rule of Faith and Obedience, it is the indispensable Duty of every Christian, to discard so great an Error, and to believe that there are three Divine Subsistencies in the Deity, and that these three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are but one God. To whom be Glory and Praise, now and for evermore. *Amen.*

F I N I S.





The CONTENTS.

Chap. I. **T**HE Case is briefly stated. *Pag. 1.*

Chap. II. Sheweth that there is but one God, the Creator of all things. *Pag. 6.*

Chap. III. Asserteth a Plurality of Divine Substances. *Pag. 8.*

Chap. IV. Proveth the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1. By his Names. *Pag. 11.* 2. That God in the Old Testament in divers Places, is Christ in the New. *Pag. 13.* 3. By seven particular Texts of Scriptures. *Pag. 16.* 4. That Christ preexisted his Incarnation in his Divine Nature. *Pag. 26.* And is no Angel incarnate, *Pag. 30.* but is eternal. *Pag. 32.* 5. By his Works. *Pag. 35.* 6. By Divine Worship given to him. *Pag. 38.*

Chap. V. Proveth the Deity of the Holy Ghost. 1. That he is a Divine Person. *Pag. 43.* 2. His Deity is asserted from several Scriptures. *Pag. 45.* 3. By his Works. *Pag. 48.* 4. By Divine Worship. *Pag. 52.*

Chap. VI. Proveth the Unity of the Holy Trinity. *Pag. 54.*

Chap. VII. Containeth some Explications of the Holy Trinunity. 1. Of the essential Being of God. *Pag. 64.* 2. Of a Divine Person. *Pag. 64.* 3. Of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. *Pag. 65, 66.* 4. Of the Unity of the Holy Trinity. *Pag. 66.* 5. Of the Distinctions between the Divine Nature and the Persons, and some Shadows by way of Comparison. *Pag. 67.* 6. Of the Union of Christ's two Natures. *Pag. 74.*

P A R T. II. Objections answered. *Pag. 76.*

e
f
f
e
a
6.